OUTLINES

OF

CHURCH HISTORY,

WITH

SPECIAL REFERENCE

TO THE

Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Church.

COMPILED

BY THE

REV. J. P. MARCUS.
BALLYMONEY.

"THAT THE GENERATION TO COME MIGHT KNOW THEM."

LONDONDERRY:
PRINTED BY JAMES MACPHERSON,
At the Standard Steam Book Printing House.
1869.

ERATTA.

Page 34, line 9 from bottom, for *wreathing* read *writhing*.

Page 39, line 15 from bottom, for 1669 read 1699.

Page 54, line 16 from bottom, for *persecute* read *prosecute*.

Page 98, line 3 from bottom, (in some copies) for *by* read *of*.*

The above *Eratta*, and some minor typographical errors, the intelligent reader can easily correct with a pen.

* "Live of the Gospel." The ministers of the Gospel are to live of the Gospel. When the Gospel has the proper effect it will make men liberal; and *giving* will be regarded not as a *grief*, but as a *grace*. "See that ye abound in this grace also."

COMPILER'S PREFACE.

These OUTLINES were prepared at the request, and published with the general approbation, of the Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Synod. The Compiler has made his Selections from what he believes to be Authentic Sources:—From *Sketches of Ecclesiastical History*, which at one time formed the *Historical Testimony* of the *General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church* in the United States, from Dr. *Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*, from the *Israel of the Alps*, from Dr. *Hetherington's History of the Church of Scotland*, from Dr. MONTGOMERY'S *Outlines of the History of Presbyterianism*, from JOHN NEWTON'S *Works*, from *Minutes of Synod*, and some other *Pamphlets* and *Magazines*. It may appear to some like boasting when mention is made of the Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Church, as a *model for imitation;* but the reference is not so much to the ministry and membership—although it is trusted they will bear a favourable comparison with those of other sections—as to her doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, and to her Scriptural views on Ministerial Support. If the Writer has made any mistakes in recording facts, he will feel thankful to be corrected. As he desires to avoid all personalities, in regard, especially, to ministers of the Gospel, of excellent private character, whose views are impugned in quotations made, the candid reader will pardon the frequent occurrence of some such names in the documents cited. If the cause of truth be advanced by these "Outlines," the Author's end will be gained.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I. PAGE.

The State of the Church from the Creation to the Giving of the Law at Mount Sinai, ... 5

CHAPTER II.

From the Giving of the Law to the Birth of Christ, ... 9

CHAPTER III.

From the Birth of Christ to the Reformation, .. 12

CHAPTER IV.

From the Reformation to the Constitution of the Reformed Presbytery, ... 20

CHAPTER V.

From the Constitution of the Reformed Presbytery to the Constitution of the Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Synod, ... 40

CHAPTER VI.

From the Constitution of the Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Synod to the Present Time, ... 90

APPENDIX.

No. 1.—Terms, &c., ... 103

No. 2.—Petition, &c., ... 104

No. 3.—Act, &c., ... 105

No. 4.—Persecution, &c., ... 107

No. 5.—The Covenanters, ... 120

No. 6.—The Westminster Assembly, ... 122

OUTLINES

OF

CHURCH HISTORY,

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE

TO THE

Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Church.

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF THE CHURCH FROM THE CREATION TO THE GIVING OF THE LAW AT MOUNT SINAI.

God has ever dealt with man in the way of a covenant. When our first parents had broken the covenant of works, intimation was given them of a better covenant—the covenant of grace—which can never be broken. This covenant was made from eternity between the Father and the Son; yet, when sinners of our race, in the day of believing, are enabled to acquiesce in it, God is said to make with them a covenant, yea, an everlasting covenant. Now, we find from the statements and declarations of the Sacred Word, that it is the duty of the people of God not only to believe with the heart, but also to confess with the mouth. The original pair were the first Church, and the blessed Redeemer Himself the first preacher, and the first priest, who directed the worship of God upon the footing of the revelation of His grace. Mercy flows through a covenant system,

and it is externally exhibited under a covenant form. The visible Church, as a society, is now in covenant with God. The covenant between God and His Church consists in God's proposing a certain form of religion for the external dispensation of His grace, and in the Church professing to receive and engaging to perform—in the strength of promised grace—every part of religious worship, agreeably to that very form which He has appointed.

Not only are the saints interested in the covenant of grace, but the Church, as a visible society, is a *covenant* society. God was then eminently present in the Church, and conversed with men, supplying the want to the Church of other means of increasing in religious knowledge. Immediate revelations and domestic institutions supplied the Church at that early period with adequate information. The Sabbath, which was instituted at the end of the week of creation, was now observed; and divinely appointed sacrifices were offered. The two sons of Adam and Eve—Cain and Abel—presented offerings to Jehovah. Cain brought of the fruits of the ground an offering unto the Lord. Abel brought of the firstlings of the flock, and of the fat thereof; and the Lord had respect to the offering of Abel, which was offered in faith, and with reference to the great atoning sacrifice which Messiah—the seed of the woman—was to offer, when He should appear in our world to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. Unto Cain and his offering the Lord had not respect; and Cain was very wroth, and slew his brother Abel. God called the murderer to account, but spared his life. He was, however, excluded from the covenant society. He went out from the presence of the Lord, and, together with his offspring, lived in the neglect of religious ordinances.

The Church, notwithstanding, progressed through the

medium of the other children of Adam, but especially in the line of Seth. In the days of Enos, who was born in the 235th year of Adam's life, men began to be called by the name of the Lord, or to call themselves by the name of the Lord. Church-members are God's children in a spiritual sense; and they may have then been called "the sons of God," to distinguish them from the ungodly offspring of Cain. The long lives of the patriarchs in the antediluvian age rendered them living libraries of sacred knowledge. Two eminent prophets—Noah and Enoch—were also inspired to make further revelations. But at length the members of the Church formed intimacies with the wicked offspring of Cain; and the power of religion became almost unknown.

Preparing to punish general corruption, and yet preserve a Church upon earth, the Lord renewed His covenant, establishing it with Noah and his family. No other family was found righteous among the rest of mankind. No child of the New Covenant was ever afterwards to descend from any of them. By an awful deluge God swept away the world of the ungodly.

The Church is reduced to a small compass. Eight souls only are saved in the ark. God renews His covenant with Noah and his sons, and engages to preserve the world from a similar deluge.

The Church in a short time increases in numbers, but degenerates in practice. As nations were multiplied, men began to be guilty of idolatry. God nevertheless provides protection for His covenant people. The truly devout found Him to be an exceeding great reward. Pious parents continue to inculcate upon their children the maxims of virtue, to observe the external forms of religion—prayer, sacrifices, Sabbath-sanctification, and to maintain a godly conversation. Eminent men were raised up as types of the Saviour; and the Church was

instructed by the transactions of God with such eminent characters. According to the commonly received chronology,* about the middle of the time from Adam to the advent of our Lord—about 2,000 years after the creation, and 2,000 years before the birth of Christ—Abraham was born. God called him from his idolatrous country and kindred; and here we have the commencement of that important dispensation of Providence, by which one family was separated from the rest of the world, placed in a central position of the earth, and increased to a nation to preserve the knowledge and pure worship of God.

God's covenant with Abraham commences a distinct era in the history of the Church. The seed which was sown in the constitution of the Church is now expanded. The visible Church, as a covenant society, is bound to submit to all the ordinances of Divine institution. God gave Abraham the covenant of circumcision. It was a dispensation of the covenant of grace—of that covenant in which the follower of the faithful had already trusted. There was, moreover, a renovation of the ecclesiastical covenant, with some appropriate variations. It is promised to Abraham, that from him the Messiah should proceed, and that in his family the Church should hereafter continue. Jehovah not only made a covenant with Abraham, but also gave "His oath unto Isaac, and confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant." Under every form of administration the immediate children are included with their parents in the visible covenant society; and every dispensation is introduced so gradually, as that they who lived under the former economy should not lose any of their privileges by being brought under a new dispensation. Thus the *unity* of the visible Church, although

* Abp. Ussher's.

it experiences the necessary alterations in external form, is constantly preserved. The identity of the good olive tree is maintained, although some of its branches be broken off, and others graffed in. For four centuries did the arrangements made with Abraham, as the representative of the Church, remain for the consideration of the people of God, before the arrangements were fully carried out. Circumcision was indeed practised in his family, but the visible Church was not so fully organized as that all others were without its pale, and their forms of worship rejected by Jehovah. Prophets and priests occasionally received a Divine commission to instruct men in the knowledge of the Will of God, and to conduct the devotions of certain parts of the Church. During this period there was no written revelation, nor were the forms of worship such as required a regular stated ministry.

The *patriarchal dispensation*, wisely adapted by the Head of the Church to the state of the world, continued in operation until the law was given by Moses at Mount Sinai. The Church at this period looked forth as the morning.

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE GIVING OF THE LAW TO THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

Such an organization of the ecclesiastical body as may serve the purposes of religion, typify the Redeemer, and preserve the Israelites distinct from the nations around them, is now become more necessary than ever. A suitable constitution is provided for the Church by the Divine Head. The descendants of Jacob being marvellously emancipated from Egyptian bondage, under the conduct of Moses, have their constitution delivered them in a covenant form.

The covenant at Sinai was not the covenant of works, neither was it the covenant of grace, but a covenant founded on the covenant of grace—an external dispensation of that covenant.

The children of Israel, however, very early as a people, proved unsteadfast and perfidious in the covenant. Even at the very time when Moses was in the Mount with God, receiving the two tables of the Moral Law, they were engaged in the practice of idolatry. Intimation was given to Moses to descend, in language that gave him to understand that they were chargeable with sin and folly. When he and Joshua came near enough to witness the golden calf the people had made, and their dancing before it, the anger of Moses was so excited, that he threw from him the tables of stone which he had received from God, and broke them in pieces, probably intimating by that action that the recent covenant between God and them was broken on their part, and consequently rescinded on his.

After the terrible punishment of the idolators for their sin, the Lord pardoned the people, and received them again into favour, gave commandment to Moses to hew two tables of stone, like unto the first, and present them to Him on the top of the Mount. At the end of *forty* days Moses received the tables of stone, written over with the same words which the broken ones had contained, with the ten commandments, and this was perhaps intended to intimate the renewal of the covenant between God and the Hebrew people.

During the stay of Moses in the Mount, the form of the tabernacle which he had been previously directed to construct, seems to have been exhibited to him; and he was commanded to carry into effect the instructions he had received. The plan of the new establishment was highly acceptable to the people, and they entered into it

with eagerness and zeal. No sooner were they made acquainted with the materials which would be required for the work of the tabernacle and its contents, and for the dress and ornaments for the priests, than they poured in, with the most profuse liberality, whatever suitable articles they possessed.

When we consider that all the offerings were voluntary, with the exception of the small sum of half a shekel of silver, levied upon every male above twenty years of age, and yet find that the whole contribution of gold and silver was worth about £185,000 of our money, we may have some idea, not only of the splendour of the small fabric, on which so much wealth was expended, but also of the willingness of the Israelites for the work. Such, indeed, was the earnestness of all the parties concerned that the whole was completed in less than six months. The covenant between the Jewish people and their God consisted in his proposing to them the whole system of ecclesiastical polity now exhibited, and requiring their submission to it, with an express engagement to observe it in every particular.

Circumcision and the passover sealed the ecclesiastical covenant to every member of the visible Church.

Divine revelation is committed to writing; and the Book of the Covenant is deposited in the hands of the Hebrews, as the rule of their faith and manners. The state of religion among God's covenant people was very much affected by their connexion with other nations. The Church suffered or prospered as the Lord withdrew or afforded his extraordinary superintendence. Eminent prophets and priests, and judges and kings, were raised up at different times for promoting the work of reformation, while the sword of the heathen enemy was often providentially employed to correct, for their sins, God's covenant Israel. The period of suffering was usually

an admonition to the duty of repentance; and the dawn of reformation called the Church and nation to a solemn renovation of their covenant with God. The people of God were a covenant people under the Mosaic economy. Moses developed a second time, and still more minutely than before, the conditions on which Jehovah, their God and King, would govern His people. In full view of these conditions, and in order to impress them more deeply upon their minds, he caused the *whole people*, even the women and children, again to take a solemn oath of obedience; and that not only for themselves, but also for* their posterity. The descending nature† of covenant obligation was recognised by the ancient people of God. The Israelites made a covenant with‡ the Gibeonites; and the descendants of those who immediately entered into covenant with God, at a distance of above 400 years after the federal transaction was entered into, are punished‖ by Jehovah for its violation.

CHAPTER III.

FROM THE BIRTH OF CHRIST TO THE REFORMATION.

When the fulness of time was come—the time appointed from eternity—the time foretold in the ancient prophecies—the time to which the former dispensation had express reference—the long-expected Messiah appeared as the Saviour of sinners and the surety of His people. As had been foretold in the Old Testament Scriptures, He was born of a virgin of the family of David, in the town of Bethlehem. The Saviour was born in the reign of Augustus, the Roman Emperor, when that Empire was at the summit of its splendour, according to the commonly received chronology, about 4,000 years from the creation of the world.

* See Deut., chapters xxviii., xxix., xxx. † Deut. v., 2, 3.
‡ Joshua ix. ‖ 2 Saml. xxi., 1, 2.

A succinct history of the life of Jesus may be gathered from the writings of the inspired Evangelists in the New Testament Scriptures. In these we have a simple, truthful, and infallible record of the life and death of the Lord Jesus Christ. From the Gospel narrative we learn how Jesus was born in circumstances of more than ordinary abasement, how He went about doing good, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

When the Redeemer came to His own covenant people—the Jews—generally speaking, His own received him not. The Jewish Sanhedrim, or great council, decreed that whoever would confess Him should be put out of the synagogue—a punishment which seems to have included not only exclusion from religious privileges, but also deprivation of worldly property. It was somewhat similar to outlawry with us. Of those who professed attachment to the cause of Jesus, not a few went back and walked no more with Him. The number of Christians that assembled at Jerusalem after His ascension are said to have been about 120. When our Lord had appointed a time and place for meeting with His disciples after His resurrection—although we have reason to believe that none of His genuine disciples would be voluntarily absent on the occasion—the whole number assembled is reckoned at about 500. How small a company this, when compared with the many thousands among whom He had conversed in all the cities and villages through which He had passed, preaching the Gospel, and performing innumerable miracles, for three years and a-half!

The history of the Church, in the Acts of the Apostles, supersedes the necessity for any detailed account of the state of Christianity during the period of about *thirty-three* years, immediately after the ascension of our Lord. Some important facts attested in this Book re-

ceive confirmation from profane history. After our Lord's ascension, according to His promise, the Holy Spirit was poured out in copious effusion, and great multitudes became obedient to the faith. But the Apostolic age had scarcely elapsed before the seeds of error and corruption were sown, and Christians began to divide themselves into different sects, each striving to force the doctrines of the Gospel into conformity with the systems they had respectively embraced. These attempts acquired strength by degrees, and laid the foundation of those animosities and disputes which afterwards troubled and perplexed the Church.

Injurious as were the schisms among the early Christians, during the first century of the present dispensation, more pernicious changes took place in the second century. Towards the close of this century a new sect of philosophers arose, and spread with amazing rapidity through the greater part of the Roman Empire, and proved extensively injurious to the cause of Christianity. The whole history of the heathen gods was turned into an allegory, and the doctrines of the different sects more or less warped to suit the purpose. This gave occasion to that slothful and indolent course of life which still continues to be led by numerous monks and nuns, retired into cells, and sequestered from society, and to a multitude of vain and foolish ceremonies, casting a veil over truth, and giving support to the grossest superstition.

One circumstance must, at least, have had a salutary tendency, though not adequate to the purpose of entirely checking the career of pride and profligacy by which the ministers of the religion of Jesus were characterized, namely, the uncertain tenure by which they held the means of gratifying their passions, from the storms of persecution with which they were visited by the heathen

civil rulers, and which almost continually threatened them, and not unfrequently burst over their heads.

The sufferings of Christians from Pagan persecution drew to a close in the early part of the fourth century, for the Emperor, Constantine the Great, either from conviction or policy, embraced Christianity, which henceforth became the religion of the Empire. Heathenism was now, in a great measure, abolished throughout the Roman Empire. Pagan idols were now destroyed, and their temples pulled down. The heathen priests were banished and dispersed. Splendid and magnificent houses of Christian worship were erected, and the ministers of the Christian religion largely endowed.

Nominal Christianity was greatly corrupted before the establishment of Christianity by Constantine; but much more so after its establishment, and the endowment of its ministers. In the first general council, however, which was held at Niece, A.D. 325, the opinions of Arius were condemned, and the Popes declared equal in dignity with the other Bishops. Arius was re-called by the Emperor from banishment in the year 330, and laws that were made against him repealed, while his chief protector Eusebius, of Nicomedia, and his vindictive faction, were permitted to vex and oppress the partisans of the Nicene Council in various ways. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, was one of those who suffered most from the violent measures of the Arian party.

A second General Council was held at Constantinople, A.D. 381, in which other erroneous opinions were condemned, particularly the opinion of Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, and his partisans, that the Holy Ghost is a Divine energy diffused throughout the Universe, and not a person distinct from the *Father* and the *Son*. At this time the Christian religion is said to have made remarkable progress among the Goths and Huns

and some others. Still, many corruptions obtained in the nominally Christian Church. The Eucharist was administered in some places to infants, and even to deceased persons. Something like the doctrine of transubstantiation was held, and the ceremony of the elevation employed in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

A third General Council was held at Ephesus, in A.D. 431, at which Nestorious, who refused to call the Virgin Mary the Mother of God, was deposed.

A fourth General Council was held at Calcedon, A.D. 451, against Eutychas, who taught that in Christ "there was but one nature," viz.:—"that of the incarnate word."

Eutychas, who had been already sent into banishment, was condemned, though absent; and the following doctrine, which is at the present day received by the orthodox, was inculcated:—"That in Christ *two distinct natures* were united *in one person*, and that without any change, mixture, or confusion."

Christianity is said to have made great progress at this time, among the Franks and Germans. It is stated by some historians that the conversion of the Irish to the Christian faith, which had been attempted in vain by Palladius, was effected by Saint* Patrick, whose original name was Succathus, and who arrived in Ireland in A.D. 432. But, as Dr. Hetherington remarks:—"Nothing certain is known respecting the direct effects produced by the mission of Palladius. It is indeed stated by Marianus Scotus that after him St. Patrick was consecrated by Celestine, and sent as Archbishop to Ireland, where, in the course of forty years, he converted the whole island to the faith; but this account cannot be relied on, in consequence of its opposition to

* It is not by way of approbation, but on account of common usage, that the designation "Saint" is here given to Patrick.

other and more authentic records. There is no proof whatever that St. Patrick had any connexion with Rome; while there is strong reason to believe that he was a native of Scotland, and the Christianity which he communicated to Ireland was, both in form and doctrine, what he had himself been taught by his Scottish instructors." Some historians are of opinion that the Irish received the Gospel and embraced Christianity before the Britons. "The History of Christianity," says Wright, in his *History of Ireland*, "among the Britons, is, if possible, more obscure than that of the conversion of the Irish. That the Gospel had not spread to any great extent in this island during the Romano-British period, seems evident from the circumstance that among the immense number of monuments of every description, belonging to that period, which have been found in all parts of England, no article has yet occurred which bears the slightest reference to Christian sentiments and practices." And quoting from the venerable Bede, the same historian says—"There came from Ireland into Britain, he tells us, in the year 565, at the commencement of the reign of the Emperor Justin, a presbyter and abbot, named Columba, to preach the Gospel to the Northern Picts, whom he converted, and he obtained from the King the Island of Iona, in which he built a monastry, and where, after a space of thirty-two years, he died and was buried."

"The Annals of Ulster state," says Hetherington, "that in the year 710, 'the family of Iona was expelled beyond Drum-Albin, by Nectan, King of the Picts.'" "This," adds the historian, "seems to have been connected with an attempt by Nectan to introduce the forms of the Anglican Church into his dominions; as we find that a Saxon priest, Ecgberht, was, at the same time, placed in Iona; while the Pictish King applied to

Ceolfrid, abbot of Girvey, for architects to erect a church after the Roman manner. * * * * The premature death of Nectan put an end to these attempts, and Iona recovered its shaken supremacy, and enjoyed about sixty years of comparative tranquillity. But a more terrible enemy appeared. The Danes and Norweigans began their piratical invasions of the Western Isles; and, in 801, Iona itself was burned, and a great number of the Culdees slain by these fierce invaders. About the year 877, the Culdees of Iona fled, from another Danish invasion, to Ireland, carrying with them the relics of Columba. Still, a considerable number of the Culdees continued to cleave to the long-hallowed abode of their ancestors, though now sadly shorn of its ancient splendour. * * * * Thus the Romish usurping power seized upon the very citadel, and this seems effectually to have driven the remains of the persecuted Culdees from Iona, which they never again recovered. The only further account of them which can be gleaned from incidental notices, represent them as scattered throughout the districts of the Western counties of Scotland, especially in Kyle and Cunningham, where, though their names soon became extinct, their tenets were preserved, in a great measure, pure from Papal corruption, till about the time that the Lollards—the followers of Jerome and Huss, and of Wickliffe, appeared like the faint day-break of the Reformation."

The Roman Pontiff had, early in the seventh century, claimed to be Christ's vicegerent, and head of the Church, and added the civil* to the ecclesiastical power; but there were reformers before *the Reformation*,

* Several unsuccessful attempts were made by the Roman Pontiffs to subject to their domination the Irish Church, the last of the National Churches of the West which preserved its independence. It succeeded in resisting these attempts until the middle of the 12th century.—*Reid.*

and although this power was very generally recognised by the Kings of the earth—the King of England not excepted—yet there were those, before the Reformation, who testified against the Pope's supremacy and the various errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome. In the valleys of the Alps the Redeemer had a band of noble witnesses.

It is admitted by all Protestant writers, that the Waldenses or Vaudois Church clearly asserted the doctrines of the Gospel three centuries before the Reformation. But there is evidence that from a far earlier period they preserved the Christian doctrines and Christian ordinances in their native purity. In the Second Council of Constantinople, 381, the title of Patriarch was given to the bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch. The institution of Patriarch preceded, and to some extent prepared the way for the Papacy. The latter was slowly matured, and the exclusive character which its organization assumed, caused the separation which then took place between the Eastern and Western Churches. Scarcely had the rupture taken place when Popery stirred up persecution, by which it effected the destruction of the Albigenses. But down to this time the Bible had been read in France in the vulgar tongue; and in Peidmont, the diocese of Milan had maintained its independence, and the Vaudois could still find shelter and peace under the jurisdiction of Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, who did not acknowledge any authority on earth as superior to that of the Bible. Ambrose occupied the See of Milan for twenty-three years, and died in 397. After his death the influence of his evangelical doctrines long continued to be felt. About the middle of the sixth century, a part of the bishops of Upper Italy refused to adhere to the decisions of the council of Chalcedon, and in 590, nine

of them separated from the Roman Church, or rather they solemnly renewed the protestation of their independence of it. The permanence of this state of things, in Upper Italy, is attested in the seventh century, by a new Bishop of Milan, Mansuetus, A.D. 677. To combat the opinion that the Pope is the head of the Church, he directs attention to the fact that the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Chalcedon, and many others, had been convoked by the Emperors and not by the Pope. The eighth century still presents us with examples of resistance to the pretensions of the Papal See in Upper Italy; and, as these pretensions are more strongly urged, we find the resistance also becoming more vigorous in the following centuries, and we can follow its traces quite on to the twelfth century, when the existence of the Vaudois is no longer doubted.

Although that interesting people were subjected to several severe persecutions, for their adherence to primitive Christianity, and refusing to submit to the domination of the man of sin, still they were never completely exterminated. God had still a seed among that people to witness for the truth, and to contend for the purity of His worship. If Apostolical Succession on the part of the ministers of religion were necessary, the ministers of the Vaudois have no need to trace their succession through the apostate Church of Rome.

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERY.

In the early part of the *sixteenth century*, many of the corruptions of Christianity were cast away, the Scriptures were acknowledged as the infallible standard of belief and conduct, and the light of the Gospel shone

through Europe with a brilliancy that had been long unknown. In the Providence of God, a poor monk was employed to expose indulgences and other corruptions of the Grand Apostacy, and to assert and vindicate the doctrine of *justification by faith alone;* and, although other instruments had prepared the way, yet MARTIN LUTHER was eminently qualified, and employed, to effect the work of Reformation so much required, and enabled to give a shock to the whole system of ecclesiastical tyrrany, error, and corruption, from which it has never recovered—a shock, the effects of which will continue to to be felt till the whole system shall be entirely destroyed.

Zuinglius, Calvin, and other eminent men, were employed in carrying on the work so auspiciously commenced; and they had the satisfaction of seeing the pleasure of the Lord, to a great extent, prospering in their hands.

The reformers were ministers at first in the Popish Church, and sought its reformation. They considered the Papacy as distinct from the Catholic Church. This is a judicious distinction, and one that ought not to be forgotten. The Catholic Church long existed without a Pope; but, by the ambitious dexterity of the Roman Pontiffs, the Papacy was, by degrees, incorporated with the Church, although it was really as foreign to its genuine constitution as a new citadel, erected by a successful usurper, would be to an ancient city. The few virtuous ministers who had remained in the Church acted upon this distinction. The city had been a long time unsafe, but it had not been absolutely deprived of its ancient liberties, until the Council of Trent, held A.D. 1545, had completely established the antichristian system of Popery, by ecclesiastical law. It is the opinion of some eminent men, that from that period Romanists

are to be considered as excommunicated from the privileges of God's visible covenant society.

The Reformation met with great opposition. It progressed, nevertheless, under the smile of an approving Providence; and, in different nations, they who sought the Lord, publicly covenanted. In the year 1530, the Lutherans had performed this important duty. They had framed the famous League of Smalkalde, which was solemnly renewed four years afterwards. On the 20th day of July, 1537, the capital articles of the Christian religion and discipline were sworn publicly by the Senate and people of Geneva. So soon as the Reformation had put on a regular appearance, and the reformers had erected a separate communion from that of Rome, the Waldenses strengthened their hands, and joined in their Churches. On the 11th of November, 1571, in a General Assembly, they entered into a solemn bond of union. They all bind themselves, under the sanction of an oath, to maintain inviolably the ancient union among all the faithful of the evangelic religion of the Waldenses down to their own time. They promise to submit to the good externals and ecclesiastical discipline already established, and to this period maintained among them. The Churches in Switzerland, in France, and in Holland, of all the Churches on the Continent of Europe, attained to the highest degree of purity.

The Lutherans still followed their great leader, in holding the monstrous absurdity of Christ's bodily presence in the Lord's Supper; and, in framing the external order of their Churches, they adhered too closely to the Popish model.

The Reformed Church, as distinguished from the Lutheran, included in it all the Protestant Churches which embraced the doctrines of Zuinglius and Calvin. The Church of England preserved her resemblance to

the Church of Rome. The scanty reformation which took place in that Kingdom, although over-ruled by Divine Providence for good to the Christian cause in general, was very far from being under the immediate direction of Christian principle. It was not conducted by an inquiring people and enlightened ministry. It was a creature of State policy. Henry VIII., a truly irreligious man, favoured, to some extent, the Reformation in England, in order to gratify his lust, his avarice, and his ambition. He was a king of haughty passions, and of principles the most despotic. To be revenged of the Pope, he was willing that the Church of England should be disconnected from the Roman; and, in order to effect this, he consented that some deviations might be made from the doctrine and order of the Papacy. He claimed to himself the authority of which he stripped the Pope. The nation and the people acquiesced in the claim, and the imperious Henry VIII. is proclaimed the head of the Church of England.

In Scotland the state of the nation was rendered, by Providence, favourable to the propagation of the true Reformed religion. The Reformation there commenced with the most learned and eminent ministers. It was gradually advanced, not as an engine of State power, but as one totally distinct from the policies of the present world. The Crown was opposed to the Protestant interest, and could not, therefore, under the mask of friendship, introduce antichristian corruption into the Reformation Church; and it was too weak to destroy the Protestant cause. The nobility overawed the monarchy, and shielded the community from danger, while the faithful service of John Knox, and other able ministers, propagated the Reformation among the people, until the mass of the nation came under its influence, and the monarchy had not power to subdue religion into

an engine of State policy; but christianity influenced the national society to render its civil constitution subordinate to the laws of heaven.

To protect themselves from the persecution of the Popish party, and to promote the interests of the Reformed religion, the Scottish Presbyterians, on different occasions, entered into solemn covenant engagements. In 1580, the First National covenant was subscribed by the King and his household, and in 1581 by all ranks of men in the kingdom. This covenant was renewed in 1590, 1596, and in a very solemn manner in 1638. The last-mentioned covenant consisted of three parts; the first, the old covenant of 1581, exactly as at first prepared; the second, the Acts of Parliament condemning Popery, and confirming and ratifying the Acts of the General Assembly. This was to show that the Covenanters were acting legally. The third part of the covenant was the application of the whole to the present circumstances. The great objects engaged to, in this Covenant, were the renunciation of Popery, and, in terms of the supplementary bond of 1638, of Prelacy also; the steadfast maintenance of the true religion; and of unwavering fidelity to one another, and to the civil magistrate, in prosecuting these objects.

This covenant was accepted by the nation generally, and was in an eminent degree successful in securing the objects contemplated.

The Lord had also much people in England at this time. While the Church of Scotland was improving the Geneva model, by rendering the Confession of Faith more full and explicit, and the whole order of the church more correct and definite, the same principles were rapidly progressing in England. Under the name of Puritans, the friends of primitive christianity were known in that realm. Civil liberty accompanied re-

ligion in its progress, and it would have been a happiness to the world had she never forsaken or out-run her heavenly guide and companion. To the Puritans alone, under God, the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution They stemmed the torrent of despotic power, which threatened to overwhelm the nation.

The spirit of the nation was roused at length, and produced an invitation to reform the church. An ordinance of Parliament called upon the most pious and learned men of the nation, to meet at Westminster on the 1st of July, 1643, to consult together, and advise the Parliament touching the concerns of religion. This assembly was not designed for a national synod, or a representative body of the clergy, but only as a council to the Parliament. The civil authority sought advice in advancing the cause of truth and holiness, and called the eminent men together of which the assembly was composed, as a committee of arrangement to promote the interest of religion, and the further reformation of the church. This assembly, with the assistance of commissioners from the Church of Scotland, drew up and exhibited to the world, in a Confession of Faith and Catechisms, Directory for Worship, and a plan of Church Government, the most definite, Scriptural, and complete system which had ever been exhibited to any council or assembly. It was intended as a system of uniformity, which should unite, in one church, the friends of religion in England, Scotland, and Ireland.

Such a system was desirable, as these nations were entering into a Solemn League and Covenant, for themselves and their posterity, that all things might be done in God's house according to God's revealed will. The Solemn League and Covenant was drawn up by a Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and Commissioners from England. It passed both

the Assembly and the Convention of Estates at Edinburgh in one day; and, being sent to England, it was ratified by the Assembly and the Parliament. On Monday, the 25th of Sept., 1643, in the church of St. Margarets, Westminster, Mr. Nye read this Covenant from the pulpit, article by article, each person standing uncovered, with his right hand lifted up bare to heaven, worshipping the great name of God, and swearing to the performance of the engagements in the Covenant. It was afterwards subscribed by the House of Commons, and by the Assembly. It was sworn by the House of Lords, on the 15th day of October. This covenant binds these nations to the preservation of the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the Church of Scotland. It also binds to constant exertions to establish uniformity in religion over the Three Kingdoms, and to perpetual perseverance in the same cause against all opposition.

In consequence of this mutual league, the Scottish army entered England for the purpose of co-operating with that of the Parliament, and King Charles I. was unable to make head against the combined armies. The English Parliament sent propositions to his Majesty, by acceding to which he might obtain peace; but he would not accede to them any more than to the Scottish Covenant.

Every reader of English History knows that King Charles I. was condemned to death by his own Parliament. The most strenuous exertions were made by the loyal Covenanters to prevent that fearful event. For even by the terms of their Covenant, they were the avowed supporters of Monarchy based upon Scriptural principles. No sooner, therefore, did they receive the intelligence of their Sovereign's death, than they hastened to proclaim his son King, by the designation of Charles

II., not omitting, however, in their proclamation, the significant intimation that their support of his pretensions to the throne would involve the necessity of his subscribing the Covenant.

The restoration of the British Monarchy was accompanied with national perjury. The prelacy and the throne were established in blood. The Reformation was overturned, the covenant was broken, and upwards of 20,000 Presbyterians died, as martyrs, in defence of "Christ's Crown and Covenant."

Charles II. was at the Hague, a town in Holland, when he was proclaimed King. Commissioners were immediately sent to treat with him, but he refused to give the required satisfaction, and they returned to Scotland without him. Next year Commissioners were again despatched to treat with him. They found him at Breda, a city of Dutch Brabant. He there pursued his wanton pleasures, and upon the Saturday before he left that city, after having agreed to the terms of the treaty, he returned to his revellings, and refused submission to the terms. Upon the following Sabbath, he, as an Episcopalian, took the Sacrament kneeling, and thus sealed his opposition to Presbyterians. Indeed, at the very time the Commissioners arrived at Breda, the King was hearkening to the sanguinary counsels of Montrose, by whose means he hoped to gain Scotland, without any treaty, the terms of which might hamper his future proceedings. The intelligence of Montrose's defeat reached him in time to induce him to comply with the requirements of the Scottish Parliament. He accordingly hastened on board, and set sail for Scotland in company with the Commissioners. Before he landed he subscribed the Solemn League and Covenant, although Livingstone, who doubted his sincerity, was anxious that it should be postponed till his Majesty

should reach Scotland, and give some satisfactory proofs of his sincerity. The young King landed on the 16th of June, 1650, near the mouth of the river Spey, and advanced to Stirling, where he was met by the chief nobility of the kingdom. He again subscribed it when he was crowned at Scoon, January 1st, 1651—thus becoming, to the great delight of the Scottish people, a Covenanted King. They calculated on seeing Presbyterianism established by law, as the national religion, being already the national religion in point of fact.

This expectation, however, was doomed to experience a speedy disappointment. Charles II. was scarcely seated on the throne, when, in utter defiance of his twice repeated vow, he turned upon the very party who had raised him to power. In England, his first step was to restore that very prelacy which he had twice sworn "to extirpate." His second step was to pass the infamous Act of Uniformity, through the operation of which, in obedience to the dictates of conscience, 2,000 ministers nobly resigned livings which they could not retain without a sinful conformity; although Calamy and Baxter were tempted by the offer of bishopricks, and many others had the lure of deaneries, archdeaneries, and other splendid settlements, cast before them. His third step was to prevail upon the servile Parliament to pass the *Conventicle Act*, by which the ejected ministers, and all other dissenters, were prohibited, under the severest penalties, from assembling to worship God according to the way appointed in His Word.

In Scotland the perfidious Charles assumed unlimited power, both in ecclesiastical and civil affairs, re-established the Prelacy, and caused himself to be acknowledged the head of the Church. The first blow fell upon the most valuable man in the nation, the

pious Marquis of Argyle. The ungrateful monarch procured the murder of the nobleman who patronized him in his youth, and placed the crown upon his head.

Against the violation of the covenant, the Scottish Presbyterians loudly remonstrated, and sent the Rev. James Sharp, one of their ministers, to lay their remonstrance before the King. Sharp came back from London Archbishop of St. Andrew's, and appointed also to the highest station in the civil administration of Scotland! This infamous traitor became the furious and unrelenting persecutor of the honest Covenanters. Every minister who had been elected by the people, and had not been ordained by the Episcopal bishop, was ordered, on pain of instant dismissal, to submit to Episcopal ordination and induction. Unhappily, too many complied with this infamous demand, and yet three hundred and fifty upright men, chiefly in the Western counties, had the courage to brave all the evils of poverty, and all the terrors of arbitrary power, sustained by ecclesiastical rancour and military intimidation. With these honest men, the great mass of the people deeply sympathised; but as usual, in religious concerns, the nobility and gentry manifested little integrity, and the multitude, without leaders, without means, without organization, were unable to throw off the yoke that galled them. Still they did not tamely submit. Many of them suffered plunder, insults, and the greatest indignities, from the soldiery, rather than enter the Episcopal Churches. Their faithful ministers prayed and preached from house to house, and the glens and mountains echoed by night with the solemn sounds of their united praise. Even in these mountain glens and wilds, however, they were frequently and brutally assailed by the soldiers, until, patience being at last exhausted, they publicly assembled at Lanark, in 1666,

and, after earnest devotions, renewed their vows of adhesion to the Solemn League and Covenant—published a declaration of their principles and grievances—and took up arms in defence of their Christian privileges. Two subaltern officers, named Wallace and Learmont, placed themselves at their head—their beloved ministers marched in their ranks—and, surprising Sir James Turner, at Dumfries, they made him prisoner, but treated him with lenity. In consequence of their thus proclaiming the Covenant, they obtained the honorable name of *Covenanters;* and knowing that hundreds of thousands participated in their sentiments, they calculated that multitudes would flock to the standard they had erected. In this hope they were grievously disappointed; their entire force never exceeded 2,000 men, and when, on advancing towards Edinburgh, it was ascertained that Dalziel, a reckless General, was advancing against them, with a considerable army, their numbers dwindled down to 800 men. The small body attempted to return to the West, over the Pentland hills, where they were intercepted by the King's forces. Animated by their ministers, they sang a Psalm, and rushed upon the enemy with undaunted courage. For a moment they threw the disciplined ranks into confusion, by the intensity of their onset, but in a short time they were entirely defeated. Forty were killed on the ground, and 130 were taken prisoners. These last afforded Archbishop Sharp a favourable opportunity of exercising his power. At the instigation of that clerical monster, ten were hanged on the gibbet, at Edinburgh; and, by a refinement of cruelty, thirty-five were executed, in different places, before their own doors! All these might have saved their lives by simply renouncing the Covenant, but not one of them would save his life by the denial of his principles. So far from shrinking they

sang psalms of praise to God at the foot of the gallows, and one of them, named M'Cail, actually died in an ecstacy of joy and devotion. His last words were, "Farewell sun, moon, and stars; farewell world and time; farewell weak and frail body. Welcome eternity; welcome angels and saints; welcome Saviour of the world; and welcome God, the Judge of all." The proceedings against *conventicles*, as the meetings of the Covenanters were called, continued during the early part of the year 1669, and in order to enforce the suppression of these meetings, as effectually as possible, there were appointed collectors of the fines, who were sent to the several districts affected. But the collectors fell far short of the soldiery in their exactions, so that the Covenanters obtained some mitigation of their sufferings. The Archbishop of Glasgow exerted himself to the utmost to oppress the non-conforming ministers; but when they were called before the Council, their defence was so calmly urged, and with such strength of reason, that the proceedings against them were allowed to drop, greatly to the mortification of the disappointed Archbishop.

But the chief event of this year was the passing of the first indulgence. The nobility had been weary of the continued course of persecution in which the intolerance and cruelty of the prelate kept them engaged, and Sharp's duplicity and tyranny had at length impelled the King to prohibit his further interference in the affairs of the nation. At length, on the 15th July, a letter from the King was laid before the Council, containing the indulgence. Its chief provisions were, that the Privy Council should appoint so many of the ejected ministers as had lived peaceably and orderly, either to return to their parishes from which they had been expelled, if still vacant, or to such others as the Council should approve

of: that they should be allowed to receive the stipend of such parishes upon condition of their receiving the consent of the patron, and collation from the Bishop, to which, if they would not submit, they should only possess the manse and glebe: that they should be strictly enjoined to keep Presbyteries and Synods, that is, to attend diocesan meetings held by the prelates; and they were not to allow people from the other parishes to attend their churches and receive ordinances; and all these favours were to be withdrawn if they should publicly speak or preach against the ecclesiastical supremacy of the King. In conclusion, it is declared, that seeing all pretences for conventicles are thus taken away, if any should thereafter presume to hold or frequent them, "our express pleasure is, that you proceed, with all severity, against the preachers and hearers, as seditious persons, and contemners of our authority." Respecting this indulgence, Dr. Hetherington employs the following language:—"Viewing it, therefore, solely as a matter of principle, we have no hesitation in saying that not one of the ejected ministers ought to have accepted the indulgence, because it was impossible to do so without sacrificing the fundamental and essential principle of the Presbyterian Church—that which constitutes its glory and life—the sole sovereignty of Christ." Sharp, who consoled his brethren, who thought the indulgence too favourable, and promised to do his utmost "to make it a bone of contention to the Presbyterians," was too successful in promoting his scheme. The whole number of ministers who were included in the first indulgence amounted to forty-two.

The King, however, made another effort to conciliate the disaffected Covenanters. A second indulgence was granted on the 3rd of September, 1672. It had for its object the collecting together, into the narrowest possible

bounds, the non-conforming Presbyterian ministers; and its concluding clause strictly prohibited the indulged ministers from preaching to any other Churches than these of the parishes in which they were confined. To some of the ministers who accepted the second indulgence the King granted an annual pension of £20—a sum, at that time, not inconsiderable—until they should be able to obtain settlements. Respecting this indulgence the historian last quoted says—"Had the Presbyterian Ministers looked only to the inevitable conclusion to which their principles must lead, they would not have hesitated one moment about rejecting the indulgence."

Many ministers did still reject the indulgence, and returned with redoubled energy to preaching in the fields and other public places, in defiance of the civil authorities. The Conventicle Act imposed fines and imprisonment, but a new act subjected all persons preaching in the fields or attending upon such services, to utter confiscation of goods, or to death, at the discretion of the King's council. The consequence was that field-preaching became universal in the South and West—the people assembling in vast numbers, armed for self-defence. An attempt to disperse one of these great assemblies, congregated upon Loudon-Hill, led to the disastrous battle of Bothwell-Bridge, A.D. 1679. Captain Graham, better known by the name of Claverhouse, and afterwards created Viscount Dundee, was the officer who commanded the royal forces on the occasion, and was repelled with the loss of thirty men. This temporary success animated the Covenanters, and in a few days they marched upon Glasgow, which they took after a smart engagement. Then they displaced the Episcopal clergy, and issued a proclamation, declaring that they fought against the King's supremacy,

against Popery and Prelacy, and against a Popish successor. Charles despatched the Duke of Monmoth, with some English cavalry, and these being joined by the Scottish Guards and Militia, the Duke proceeded in quest of the Covenanters, who, to the number of 8,000 men, had taken up a favourable position at Bothwell-Bridge, on the river Clyde, between Hamilton and Glasgow. None of the nobility, and almost none of the gentry, had joined the Covenanters. Their clergy were, in point of fact, almost their only leaders; and, except in the singular qualification of Christian courage, no army could have been worse prepared to sustain the attack of regular troops. They wanted skill, discipline, arms and ammunition, and the result was what might have been expected: 700 were slain in battle or in flight, and 1,200 were taken prisoners. Of the latter, 900, who promised to live peaceably, were pardoned; 300, who declined to accept of pardon on the conditions offered, were shipped for Barbadoes, but perished at sea; and two of their ministers were executed. Claverhouse, still smarting under the mortification of his unexpected repulse at Loudon-Hill, scoured the country far and wide, and committed and encouraged crimes in cold blood, the very recital of which causes humanity to shudder. Houses were burnt over their inmates; maids and matrons brutally violated; infants raised alive into the open air, wreathing upon the soldiers' spears; and husbands and sons mutilated and butchered before the eyes of their wives and mothers! And all this was done in the name of religion, in a Protestant land, and on the vain plea of promoting uniformity of faith and worship!

In the same year, A.D. 1679, Archbishop Sharp, who had been in Edinburgh attending a meeting of the Privy Council, for carrying out still soverer measures than had formerly been taken against the Covenanters,

was despatched by nine persons, some of whom were gentlemen of considerable property and rank. On the 3rd of May, at Magus Moore, about three miles from St. Andrew's, they stopped his coach and commanded him to come out, and prepare for death, judgment, and eternity. The miserable man shrieked aloud for mercy, and clung to his daughter, who was with him in the carriage. Upon his refusing to come out they fired into the carriage, but being unwilling to injure the person of the lady, their unsteady aim did not take effect, and they again commanded him to come forth, otherwise they would drag him out. At length he came out repeating his vehement cries for mercy, offering to save their lives—to give them money—to abandon his prelatic station, if they would but spare his life. His cries for mercy were in vain. They reminded him of his apostacy—of the eighteen years of bloodshed of which he had been the chief cause—of his repeated acts of perjury—of his withholding the King's letters till nine sufferers, whom it would have saved, were put to a cruel and ignominious death. Having thus set his crimes in terrible array before his face, they again exhorted him to pray to God for that mercy which he himself had never shown to man. Still the wretched man could raise no cry to heaven—a circumstance which so appalled the assassins as to cause them to stand aghast at such a spectacle of utter despair. They fired upon him, and he fell to the ground; but when they were about to depart, perceiving him still alive, they despatched him with their swords.

When the intelligence of Sharp's death reached the Council, they immediately despatched information to the King, and issued proclamations, offering a large reward for the seizure of the murderers. In this their efforts were ineffectual, for these men, after remaining together

till night, separated, and betook themselves to different parts of the country, for better concealment. Several of them joined their friends in the West, but carefully abstained from mentioning their participation in the fatal deed—so well were they aware that the principles or impulses which had excited them to the slaughter of the arch-persecutor were disavowed and condemned by almost the entire of the persecuted Covenanters, who, perhaps, were generally prepared to acquiesce in the declaration—

> "Although the wight be well away,
> The deed was foully done."

Yet prelatic writers have accused the whole body of entertaining views approving of the unhappy prelate's assassination; and the ensnaring question—Whether they approved of the killing of the Archbishop? was frequently put by the soldiers, immediate death being generally the consequence of an unsatisfactory answer.

Time would fail to speak of the sufferings of the Scottish Covenanters under Charles the Second, and his brother James, the Duke of York, afterwards King James, who pursued the same course of evil policy that had been so long carried on by Charles II.

Such atrocities as were perpetrated by vile men high in place, crushed many a conscience, broke many a spirit, and drove many a false worshipper into temples of which they could not in their hearts approve.

The witnesses for the truth became "a wasted remnant." Congregations no longer existed in the usual form, but what were termed societies were scattered over the country, and to these a few intrepid ministers still dispensed the bread of life. Occasionally, too, in defiance of the sword, the scaffold, and the gibbet, public meetings were solemnly held, in order to sustain their faith and fortitude, by renewing their covenant vows.

During the persecuting period of the Covenanters, several treatises were composed for the vindicating of their own conduct, and for strengthening the hands and encouraging the hearts of Christ's faithful witnesses, and they were not without their influence. Of this description, were *The Sufferers' Informatory Vindication, The Hind let Loose, and A Testimony against* [authoritative] *Toleration of a false religion.* It may here be properly observed, that the affecting speeches of the martyrs, who sealed their testimony with their blood, contributed greatly to support their cause. The dreadful persecution which took place in Scotland, at the time to which reference has been made, lasted for twenty-eight years. It is an ancient adage that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church." Persecution never accomplished the end it was intended to serve, and the history of the Church clearly demonstrates, that wherever the cruel engine has been employed, it has spread the opinions it was designed to check, and encouraged rather than subdued opposition. It is evident that this was the case in the tragical reigns of Charles II. and James. Men witnessed the steadiness, composure, and even triumph, with which the martyrs of the Scottish Reformation met death in its most terrific forms, and their example encouraged others to imitate their conduct.

At Lanark, at Rutherglen, and at Sanquhar, not only were illustrious assemblies convened, and a testimony to the truth faithfully and fearlessly borne, but at Drumclog and Airs-Moss, martyrs freely poured out their blood. The most eminent of these were the Rev. Richard Cameron, who fell on the field of Airs-Moss, in 1680, and by whose name—that of *Cameronians*—Covenanters are generally known in Scotland. About a year later, the Rev. Donald Cargill sealed his testimony on the scaffold, at Edinburgh; and in 1688, that noble

youth, Rev. James Renwick—the last who suffered death for the covenanted cause—was executed at the grass-market, in the same city. That year happily ended the sanguinary persecuting dynasty of the Stuarts; for, although religious liberty was not fully established under William III., the sword of persecution was, at least, no longer stained with *blood*.

The Covenanters were not *anti-Government men*, as some have alleged; but they held that persons might be so devoid of Scriptural qualifications, as to unfit them for places of power and trust; and that kings might exercise such an amount of tyranny as to forfeit their title to the throne. The principles of the Covenanters were justified by the deed of the nation, when the tyrant James was driven from the throne. The Convention of Estates assign the very same reason for the tyrant's forfeiture of the crown that had been repeatedly stated by the followers of Cameron, Cargill, and Renwick, and in defence of which, those high-principled men had cheerfully laid down their lives—"Therefore the estates of the Kingdom of Scotland, find and declare that King* James VII., being a professed Papist, did assume, &c. WHEREBY HE HATH FORFEITED THE RIGHT TO THE CROWN, AND THE THRONE IS BECOME VACANT."

While the unbending Covenanters were persecuted in Scotland in a most rigorous manner, the great majority of the Presbyterians in Ireland, as they meekly submitted to Erastian encroachments, were the subjects of royal patronage and favour. Through the instrumentality of Sir Arthur Forbes, they obtained an annual pension from the State of £1,200, to be equally divided among their ministers—a grant which has been greatly augmented, as the number of ministers receiving *Regium Donum* has greatly increased. A few in Ireland, however,

* James *Second* of England was *Seventh* of Scotland.

still adhered to their Covenant engagements, although, by doing so, they were subjected to great privations. But they were greatly encouraged to steadfastness and faithfulness by the refugees from Scotland. About the year 1671, David Houston was severely dealt with for advocating the perpetual obligation of the Covenants. He had adopted the views of the strict Covenanters from Alexander Peden, one of their most intrepid and enthusiastic preachers. These views Mr. Houston avowed and advocated at Ballymoney; and, notwithstanding the persecution he suffered from other Presbyterian ministers, he soon acquired remarkable popularity by preaching in private houses and in the open air. A place of worship was built for him at Armoy, between the Giant's Causeway and Ballycastle. There he officiated for about twelve years, amidst much love and esteem; and, as often as impaired health would permit, he preached in various parts of the counties Down, Antrim, and Derry, to the small societies of Covenanters who participated in his views. He died about the year 1669, and his mortal remains were interred in Connor church-yard.

At the Revolution settlement, Messrs. Sheilds, Linning, and Boid entered the Established Church of Scotland. The strict and consistent Covenanters, who refused all compromise of principle, were, for a length of time, without a public teacher; but they met in societies for the worship of God and for mutual edification, until they were favoured by Providence with the accession of the Rev. John M'Millan, who had made a noble but vain attempt to bring the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland back to covenanted ground. Mr. M'Millan was located in Balmaghie, in the shire of Galloway, and enjoyed great reputation for his worth and talents. His son John soon

became an able co-adjutor, and laboured chiefly in Stirling and the neighbouring districts. He and other faithful ministers also visited and kept alive the spark which David Houston had been instrumental in awakening.

The Covenanting societies in Scotland gradually assumed the stability of congregations, and John M'Millan, jun., became their professor of Theology.

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE CONSTITUTION OF THE REFORMED PRESBYTERY TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE EASTERN SYNOD.

In 1743, the Reformed Presbytery was constituted in Scotland, and a goodly number of people in the North of Ireland submitted to the jurisdiction of that Presbytery. Mr. Alexander Marshall was soon after licensed and ordained, and, in company with Mr. Main, despatched to Ireland to visit the brethren in the sister isle. Messrs. John Cameron and Thomas Cuthbertson were sent across the channel with a similar commission.

The first *Testimony* of the Reformed Presbyterians, as a distinct section of the Church, was adopted in the year 1761; and in the same year, Mr. Cuthbertson was ordained by Scottish ministers at Vow, near Rasharkin —but a few miles from Ballymoney—in the county of Antrim. Mr. William James was ordained at Bready in 1765. Mr. Matthew Linn, a native of Larne, was ordained in 1769. He resided in the vicinity of Newtownlimavady, and extended his labours through the county of Derry, and parts of Antrim and Donegal. Mr. Martin was shortly after placed at Kellswater, near Ballymena.*

* An account of the above-mentioned settlements has been recently published, with a slight variation, but agreeing in the main with what is here recorded.

In 1792, thirteen ministers had been ordained in this country. They had not yet, however, been formally detached from the Scottish Presbytery, having met hitherto as a committee of that body. But now the Presbytery "did desire and require said committee to constitute themselves into a Presbyterial capacity, on the footing of the Covenanted Testimony of the Church of Scotland, and to continue their friendly correspondence in all matters of general concern."

The first Presbytery, on this side of the channel, was constituted in 1784, and embraced six or seven ministers. In 1811, this Court was enabled to divide itself into four Presbyteries; and on the first of May, these united in constituting the Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Ireland. There were, at that time, twelve fixed pastorates, seven vacant congregations, and several preaching stations.

In the midst of surrounding defection and unfaithfulness, the Reformed Presbyterian Church continued to carry aloft the banner of a covenanted work of reformation. The Synod of Ulster was largely infected by Arianism, not to speak of Arminianism. There was scarcely any standard of orthodoxy set up; and those who believed the Lord Jesus Christ to be properly Divine sat down at the same communion table with those who held the Redeemer to be only a creature of God. There was little or no discipline exercised. The Rev. Robert Craighead, Presbyterian Minister in Dublin—son of a Presbyterian Minister of Londonderry—published a sermon on "The true terms of *Christian* and *Ministerial* communion founded on *Scripture* alone;" in which he says, "I, for my part, know no other way or course that possibly can be taken, but to admit to communion all such sincere *Christians* as own and adhere to the Scripture as the only rule of their faith

and manners, and who, in their lives and conversation, give the proper evidences of their having complied with the terms of salvation therein required, even though they should, in several points, entertain different sentiments from us and from one another."

In regard to the *discipline* of the Presbyterian Church, an extract from a sermon by Rev. James Morgan—now Dr. Morgan—Minister of the Presbyterian Church, Fisherwick-Place, published in 1823, may suffice. "The preacher," he says, "can speak feelingly on this theme, having more than once been placed in circumstances of the utmost perplexity and distress. He has been called to minister to societies among whom Christian discipline was almost unknown. To have introduced it immediately and vigorously would more than have endangered their existence. He felt that, to a great extent, there was no choice left, but either to abandon it or renounce his charge. And it is only after years of anxious solicitude and careful preparation that he now begins to hope the attempt may be made to bring his people under the influence of Christian discipline."

The Reformed Presbyterians were always careful to keep up the walls of discipline, although, by so doing, their numbers continued to be comparatively small. In a Summary of Causes of Fasting, emitted by the Reformed Presbyterian Synod in 1810, it is said—"We lament, as sincerely as any, the unpleasant consequences of religious controversy. But how much more to be lamented is the state of religious society, when all appear ready to put truth to sale, and there is no purchaser. A disposition to purchase peace at the expense of truth, at present the disposition of too many, is itself to be lamented. Nor is it probable that practical godliness shall profit by the bargain. If truth falls in our sheets, holiness cannot stand alone."

After the Revolution Settlement, when the strict Covenanters were left as sheep without a shepherd, they still continued to meet in a social capacity for the worship of God and mutual edification, and this practice was kept up in Ireland, as well as in Scotland, after they had obtained a regular ministry, and pastors to go in and out among them. In order to ascertain the state of matters throughout the body at large, they had, at particular times, a general representation of all the societies. An attempt was made to revive the practice of correspondence in Ireland, in A.D. 1807. In 1809 an address to the people, under the inspection of the Reformed Presbytery, was published. It commences in the following manner:—

"CHRISTIAN BRETHREN—Lately an attempt was made, in the counties of Antrim and Down, to revive the old, but laudable, practice of *General Corresponding*, once so conducive to the cause of religion, and propagating our Testimony. We fondly hoped any friend of Reformation would step forward to assist, promote, and encourage an effort to recover one of our Church's ancient and early attainments. Alas, these hopes have not been realized!! Opposition has been received from a quarter whence support was expected—whence support ought to have been received."

The document ends with the following address:—

"DEAR FRIENDS AND BRETHREN—We, at parting, would venture to make one remark. It appears that, for a series of years, this valuable method of intercourse has been neglected; is there no danger of us losing still more, if we are supine and indolent? In a few more passing years posterity will have cause to mourn over our broken arches, fallen columns, and valuable monuments of reformation, reared at the expense of much blood and treasure! At such an idea the heart sickens, and the friends of Reformation turn pale.

"(By approbation of the friends of General Corresponding),

"J. M'MILLAN, Clerk."

It does not appear, however, that much encouragement was given to the proposed correspondence. Perhaps some fears were entertained of a tendency to independency, on the part of the advocates of the proposed correspondence. The societies, nevertheless, continued

to meet for the worship of God and Christian conversation. In these societies Church members were admitted and excluded; but, in process of time, the members of the Church were admitted, through the Sessions of the congregation, while those who dishonoured their profession were excluded from Church privilege also by the Sessions. The fellowship meetings were the means of instructing many in the knowledge of the truth, and preserving a devotional spirit among the Covenanters, while there was much deadness among the Presbyterians of other denominations. There were certain printed QUERIES put to members, on being admitted to the privileges of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, relative to belief and practice. The queries were also generally put to members before congregational meetings were held, and usually on the Friday preceding the Communion.

The Reformed Presbyterian Church in Ireland, amid much misrepresentation and reproach, observed strict discipline, and opposed private baptism, which was common among other Presbyterians. Brotherly love usually prevailed, but not without some interruptions, by jealousies and bickerings, among both members and ministers of the Church. These sometimes arose from the moderation of calls for ministers in particular congregations. There are individuals still alive (in 1869) who remember some scenes arising about the moderation of calls, particularly in Belfast and at Cullybackey. In the former town Rev. John Alexander, of Faughan and Derry, was invited to Belfast, to succeed his brother, the Rev. Josias Alexander, who died in 1823. In the latter village, Rev. Clarke Houston was finally settled.

At a meeting of Synod in 1826, on the 13th July, seven o'clock, forenoon, a protest and appeal from the minority of the Belfast congregation having been laid be-

fore Synod, and a paper having been handed to the Clerk, by the Commissioners from the minority, it was moved and seconded, that the paper be referred to a Committee of Bills, that it may be ascertained how much of it is revelent to the protest. The roll being called, this motion was negatived by a majority of one, and it was agreed that the paper be read in Synod. Against this decision Mr. Paul protested, in which he was joined by Messrs. Gamble, Alexander, Henry, and Houston.

The following reasons of protest were submitted:—

"1. By the decision, the privilege of submitting papers to a Committee of Bills is denied, and the Synod may be disgraced by the public reading of the most abusive and abominable papers.

"2. The Synod may be made a vehicle of calumny, by publicly reading the most wanton and licentious attacks on private characters.

"3. The proceedings of Synod are in danger of being retarded or thrown into confusion by the introduction of irrevalent matter.

"4. The decision against which we protest, denies to a Presbytery what, so far as we know, has never been denied, and we humbly conceive cannot, without injustice and tyranny, be denied to the meanest member of any Presbyterian community."

The spirit of contention then manifesting itself, continued till the minority was erected into a new congregation.

In 1828, the Eastern Presbytery report, that the Rev. W. Henry is their Moderator, and the Rev. J. W. Graham their Clerk, for this year; that the days of Thanksgiving and Fasting have been observed in all the congregations under their inspection; that they moderated a call in the Congregation of Knockbracken, addressed to Mr. Thomas Houston, Probationer, which he accepted on the 28th of August, and having gone through second trials, was ordained on the 8th of April, to the office of the sacred ministry, and pastoral charge of that congregation; that the Sacrament of the Lord's

Supper has been dispensed in all their congregations, with the exception of Knockbracken; that they have under their inspection, as students, Mr. Hugh Hawthorne, and Mr. William Toland; and that they beg to submit some matters to the consideration of Synod for advice.

In 1829, the Annual Meeting of Synod was held in Ballymena. The following table gives the names of the members of Synod (in 1829), with the several congregations represented:—

WESTERN PRESBYTERY.

MINISTERS.	ELDERS.	CONGREGATIONS.
William Gamble,	William King,	Ramelton, Gortlea.
.....	Jeremiah Smyth,	Bready.
James Sweeny,	Samuel Alexander,	Faughan.
Alexander Fullerton,	William M'Cloy,	Newtowlimavady.

EASTERN PRESBYTERY.

MINISTERS.	ELDERS.	CONGREGATIONS.
John Paul,	David Speers,	Loughmourne.
William Henry,	Thomas M'Calmont,	Newtonards.
Clarke Houston,	James Kinnear,	Cullybackey.
John Alexander,	James Watson,	Belfast.
J. W. Graham,	James Malcomson,	Bailiesmill.
Thomas Houston,	William Beatty,	Knockbracken.

NORTHERN PRESBYTERY.

MINISTERS.	ELDERS.	CONGREGATIONS.
W. J. Stavely,	Mathew Cathcart,	Kilraughts.
Simon Cameron,	James Oliver,	Ballylaggin.
James Dick,	Samuel Fletcher,	Kellswater.
James Smyth,	Robert Adams,	Drumbolg.
Samuel Carlile,	Samuel Pollock,	Ballyrashane.

SOUTHERN PRESBYTERY.

MINISTERS.	ELDERS.	CONGREGATIONS.
Hans Boggs,	Hugh Stewart,	Ballylane.
Thomas Cathcart,	.....	Ballybay.
John Stuart,	Samuel Patterson,	Rathfriland.
John Hawthorne,	.....	Ballenon.

At this meeting of Synod, memorials from the Session and Congregation of Knockbracken, praying for

separation from the Eastern Presbytery, and to be placed under the care of another Presbytery, were read, and the Eastern Presbytery having heartily concurred in the prayer of the memorialists, their petition was granted. It was then moved and seconded that this congregation be placed under the care of the Northern Presbytery. Moved, as an *amendment*, that it be recommended to the care of the Southern Presbytery. This amendment was afterwards withdrawn, and the congregation, agreeably to the wishes of the minister and people, was placed under the care of the Northern Presbytery.

In 1830, the Synod met in Coleraine, on the 13th of July, and, after a discourse from Jer. l.: 5—"Come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten"—by the Rev Dr. M'Leod, New York, the Synod was constituted with prayer, by the Rev. James Dick, the Moderator. The Rev. Dr. M'Leod, and the Rev. Gordon, T. Ewing, from America, and the Rev. Wm. Symington, a delegate from the Reformed Presbyterian Synod in Scotland, being present, were invited to seats in court. Dr. M'Leod being called upon by the Moderator to bring forward the statements which he had intimated his intention of laying before the Synod, furnished interesting accounts of the state of religion in America, and of the circumstances of the Reformed Church there, and made to the Synod the three following propositions, viz.:—

"I. That the Synods in Scotland, Ireland, and America should, in future, correspond by Delegation.

"II. That a mutual Bond and Covenant, divested of local peculiarities, and adapted to the state of the Reformed Churches in Britain and America, and to the condition of the Church throughout the world, be agreed upon.

"III. That arrangements be entered into for having one Testimony, embracing one system of doctrine, government, worship, and discipline, and for bringing about uniformity in all things among the Churches of God throughout the nations of the earth."

The Rev. Wm. Symington, from Scotland, stated that the Synod by which he was deputed had agreed to adopt the above suggestions. Agreed that the court has the greatest satisfaction in the visit of the Rev Dr. M'Leod, from America, and in that of the Rev. Wm. Symington, as a Commissioner from the Synod in Scotland, and that the Synod express their gratitude to both for the very efficient manner in which they have made several communications, and that arrangements be made during the Sessions of Synod that their communications command the serious consideration of the court. At the meeting of Synod, it was also "moved and agreed that the Synod, regarding themselves called upon by the state of the Churches, to take measures for a more open maintenance and advocacy, and for the wider extension of the principles of the Covenanted Reformation, and regarding the public press as a powerful instrument which may be rendered subservient to the high advancement of the cause of truth, recommended to such of its members as may be able to give attention to the matter, to make arrangements for the publication of a periodical, to be circulated throughout the bounds of our religious community; and the members hold themselves engaged to use endeavours to obtain sufficient support for the undertaking from the several congregations."

In December of the same year (1830), the first Number of a Magazine, called the COVENANTER, was published, and circulated throughout the Church; and a No. was issued every month for a length of time. Among the various articles which appeared in the periodical, the subject of *Magistracy* held a prominent place. The 4th No. commences with an article on *Magistracy*, and the subject is resumed in subsequent Numbers. Many pious and intelligent Covenanters were grieved at the teachings of the *Covenanter* on the

subject. After such views on the subject of Magistracy, as grieved many members of the Church, had been put forward in the Magazine, for nearly a year, the following letter appeared in the columns of the *Belfast News-Letter*:—

THE POWER OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATE IN MATTERS OF RELIGION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BELFAST NEWS-LETTER.

SIR—In the monthly periodical styled *The Covenanter*, the following statements are made, relative to the power of the civil magistrate, in matters of religion:—"In the third place we are to observe, that the power of the civil sword (the supreme management of which belongeth to the King alone), is not to be restrained to temporal causes only, but is, by God's ordinance, to be extended likewise unto all spiritual and ecclesiastical things and causes. The civil magistrate is to use his authority in redressing the abuses committed against the first table, as well as against the second—that is to say, as well in punishing of an heretic, or an idolator, or a blasphemer, as of a thief, or a murderer, or a traitor." (Quoted, with approval, from Bishop Ussher's speech). "Indeed, there is not a single hint given, in all the New Testament, that the judicial laws and judicial decisions under the Mosaic Dispensation, were not to be referred to as example for imitation in the Christian economy when a similarity of circumstances might render such reference justifiable; nor that the laws against heresy, idolatry, &c., are repealed, any more than those concerning robbery or murder." "Gross and pestilent heresies should also be suppressed, and suppressed by the sword of the civil magistrate, if no gentler means prove effectual. By heresies we understand fundamental errors, imbibed spontaneously in opposition to the salutary doctrines of Scripture, and retained with pertinaceous obstinacy. Thus men are said to bring in damnable heresies, when they deny the Lord that bought them (2nd Pet. ii.: 1); or contemptuously reject the only method of salvation made known in the Word of God. 'He that despised Moses' law died without mercy, under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace?' (Heb. x.: 28, 29.) David's resolution to purge his kingdom of all slanderers, liars, deceitful workers, malicious informers, and wicked persons, is worthy the imitation of Christian rulers. 'Whoso privily slandereth his neighbour, him will I cut off; him that hath an high look and a proud heart, will not I suffer. He that worketh deceit shall not dwell within my house; he that telleth lies shall not

tarry in my sight. I will early destroy all the wicked of the land; that I may cut off all wicked doers from the city of the Lord.' (Psalm ci.: 5, 7, 8). Enthusiasts may cry out against this guardian care of the magistrates as oppressive and tyrannical; but there is no reason whatever for such a complaint, since no individual has a right to set up his own opinion in opposition to the establishment sentiments of society.".

These and similar statements, are exhibited in the *Covenanter*, particularly in the 7th, 8th, and 9th Numbers. *But, are these the real principles of the Covenanters?* Do the Covenanters, as a body, believe these doctrines?

As a reply to these questions, permit me, through you, Sir, to lay before the public a few extracts from authorized documents. The members of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, in a summary of Causes of Thanksgiving, published in 1823, express themselves thus:—"Our Church has been frequently charged with holding bloody sentiments, because the word '*extirpate*' was used in our standard, in speaking upon the duty of opposing erroneous systems. Our reasoning upon this subject was overlooked, and the cry of blood was raised against us. It was supposed that we confined salvation to our own Church; that if we had the power we would overturn every system of human government; and that we would cut off, by death, all those who would not become members of our religious community. But we see a very popular writer of the present day, a writer highly esteemed by all classes of Protestants, (M'Gavin), adopting our mode of reasoning on the subject. 'If Popery,' says he, 'ought to be opposed in every way by which error can be successfully opposed, by instructions, by argument, by the manifestation of truth, by prayer to God night and day; those who know that Popery, as well as every other system of error, is intolerable, will labour in this way for its extirpation. Now I know that there are men of such perverse minds, that they will apply what I have said of principles to persons—of errors to the individuals that hold them—and what I have said of extirpation by means of truth and argument, to extirpation by fire and sword, I must, therefore, tell them again, though I cannot give them a mind to understand it, that the things are quite distinct, and that what applies to the one cannot be made available to the other. It is as impossible to convince a man by force, as it is to kill him by an argument. To attempt, therefore, to extirpate heresy or error, by fire and sword, is as absurd as to punish a murderer by a syllogism. I would not apply force of any kind to extirpate error, yet I hold, that error in general, and Popery in particular, ought not to be tolerated—but extirpated—by the only means which can extirpate error, which has its seat in the mind, and can be effected only by rational and spiritual weapons.'"

To these sentiments of M'Gavin, our Irish Synod has appended the seal of its approbation.

The supreme judicatory of the Reformed Presbyterian Church

in Scotland, in their short account of old Dissenters, write thus:—

"While Dissenters testify against toleration, they are not to be understood as meaning a *merely* passive toleration, implying nothing more than simply permitting men to exist unmolested, to hold their different opinions, without using external violence to make them change these, or to exterminate them from the face of the earth if they do not. Forbearance of this kind, after every scriptural and rational means has been used, CANNOT BE CONDEMNED."

In accordance with these authorized sentiments, a talented member of the Scottish Synod, the Rev. Peter Macindoe, in his "VINDICATION *of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland from various charges preferred against her on the subject of civil Government*," expresses himself thus:—"Not less uncandid is the charge frequently stated in books, and insinuated in conversation, that we hold persecuting principles. So utterly groundless is this charge, *we allow*, in the fullest sense for which any Christian can plead, *the right of private judgment on religious opinions*. We consider this one of the greatest rights ever granted to man by his gracious Creator.

We are equally decided in condemning persecution, not only for religious opinions, but for opinions on any other subject whatever. Any attempt to suppress speculative errors, or propagate revealed doctrines by compulsory measures, we would view with mingled feelings of regret, indignation, and alarm. A more frightful spectacle could not possibly present itself to our sight, than that of a magistrate marching through his territories with the Bible in the one hand and the sword in the other, prosecuting a sanguinary crusade against every class of opinions that differ from his own, and making all whose minds refuse assent to the strength of his arguments, tremble at the infliction of his punishment. However anxious we are to see revelation diffused over all countries, received by all ranks, exalted to its rightful supremacy over all minds, and imparting its spiritual blessing, no less than its temporal benefits, to all the tribes of our perishing fellow-men, we *will* not consent to the use of any other than spiritual weapons in this sacred warfare—argument, eloquence, and prayer. Let those weapons be wielded with an energy, inspired by the very excellence of our cause—let truth have an open field where her opponents cannot take an undue advantage—let the minds on which we would operate expand under improved systems of education, and sounder modes of thinking—let the objections of infidelity, and scepticism, and vice, be subjected to the freest examination, and sifted with a minute scrutiny, before which they must vanish into air, and the result will be answerable to our wishes, without the aid either of military force or civil coercion." "In a powerful document," adds this eloquent divine, "published in 1684, they (the Covenanters) expressly declare, that our mind may be the more clearly understood, and for preventing further mistake anent our purposes, we do hereby jointly

and unanimously testify and declare—that as we utterly abhor and detest that hellish principle of killing all who differ in judgment and persuasion from us, it having no bottom on the Word of God or right reason, so we look upon it as a duty binding upon us, to publish openly to the world, that we are firmly and really purposed not to injure or offend any whatsoever, but to pursue the ends of our Covenants, in standing to the defence of our glorious work of reformation, and of our own lives. Sometime afterward, in a larger publication, they use still stronger language. We positively disown, as horrid murder (say they) the killing of any because of a different persuasion and opinion from us, albeit some have invidiously cast this odious calumny upon us."

At present, Mr. Editor, I shall not make a single comment, either upon these extracts, or those which I previously gave from *The* COVENANTER. They are both before the public, and let the public judge.

At our last meeting of Synod, the following resolution was unanimously carried;—

Resolved—That the Synod do not hold themselves responsible for the contents of *The* COVENANTER, agreeably to the following announcement, abriged from the cover of No. 6 of the publication:—"*The* COVENANTER" is not the authorized medium for expressing the sentiments of the body; and the responsibility of the Reformed Synod is in *no way* involved in its publication. It is just conducted, as are many other religious periodicals of the day, in connexion with a religious denomination; but the EDITOR BEING SOLELY RESPONSIBLE for the statements made, and the sentiments advocated. In No. 9, the Editor of the Covenanter makes the following statement: "At the close of the Synod, in reference to a motion in the minutes of last year, Mr. Houston mentioned, that, according to the wish of Synod, he had commenced a periodical under the title, 'The Covenanter,' and stated the satisfactory results of the experiment. A discussion having ensued relative to the terms of the minutes of last Synod, the Editor explained that the work stood upon its own merits, and general satisfaction was expressed in the extensive circulation and literary execution of the periodical." In this last statement the Editor is in error. *No such satisfaction was expressed.* The Synod is neither committed to the sentiments, nor to the literary execution of the work. The Editor, and the Editor *alone*, is responsible. I have, therefore, to request that the public will judge of the principles of Covenanters by their own *authorized statements*, and not by the statements of any individual.—I am, &c.,

JOHN PAUL.

Carrickfergus, November 11, 1831.

P.S.—I have just seen the 12th Number of *The Covenanter*, in which the conductors say—"Let it be carefully considered that those who labour to gainsay our opinions (relative to the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion) are utterly unable, either from the authorized standards, or the approved

writers of the Reformed Church, to bring forward any counter-testimony."

Whether the extracts I have given in the preceding letter are to be regarded as counter-testimony, and whether the supreme judicatories of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland and Ireland have, in the extracts given, a fair statement of their own sentiments, and the sentiments of Covenanters in general, let *The Covenanter* himself judge—let him reconcile, if he be able, his published opinions, with the authentic declarations of that very Synod of which he is a member.

J. P.

To the preceding letter a "reply" from the Rev. T. Houston, Knockbracken, Editor of *The Covenanter*, appeared in the columns of the same paper, on the 29th November, 1831.

It commences in the following manner:—

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'NEWS-LETTER.'

"SIR—Holding it to be every way injudicious and undutiful, for us at least, to discuss any religious subject with one of the ministers of our own Church, in a public newspaper, our reply to the Rev. John Paul's communication in your paper of the 18th instant, will not draw largely on the patience of your readers. For our own part, we freely say Mr. Paul is our brother, and we forgive him his trespass. Whatever he may have intended, or done, or anticipated, he has inflicted upon us no real injury; and, as we have not been within the reach of his good offices, we really are not aware how he could do us a disservice, without sinking his own reputation. We enjoy a share of public patronage, of which we could have had no expectation, and, with cheerful prospects, we are now, when Mr. P. thinks proper to wield his pen, more in our favour truly than his own, about to enter upon the second year of our labours. At no loss to discover the spirit and object of his petty compilation, we will not, at this time, say all that we think or feel concerning it—yet, for other reasons, as well as that, we owe a decent respect to the judgment of our readers, we must add a few words in our own vindication."

The Editor of *The Covenanter* goes on to confirm and establish his teaching on the subject of Magistracy by referring to the principles embodied in the National Covenant of Scotland, and the acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, from 1638 to 1649, from the parts of the Confession of Faith, and the judicial Act and Testimony, which speak of the Magistrates'

power in matters of religion. He also refers to the Scripture proofs under the passages cited from the Confession, and asserts that they "involve all the principles contained in the extracts from *The Covenanter*, for which Mr. Paul has taken what he thinks a mighty safe way of holding us up to public odium."

He concludes in the following manner:—

"The columns of a newspaper, it will be readily perceived, are not a suitable place for entering into a discussion respecting a principle of the Church's testimony; and we, therefore, once for all, repeat it, that we entirely decline any discussion, through this channel, with Mr. Paul or any other, on the views that have been advocated. While we remain in the Church, we will maintain firmly every article of her valuable testimony; and when assailed and misrepresented, as in this instance we have been, by a minister of the Church, we will look to her pure and excellent Discipline for an effectual vindication.

"The candid and religious public, who are desirous of farther information on this topic, and the supporters of the Periodical, may find the matter discussed at large in some of the succeeding numbers.

"THE COVENANTER."

The following is the *rejoinder* to the preceding letter; and, as it is brief and racy, it is here given in full:—

SIR—To my letter of the 18th November, the Editor of *The Covenanter* has published, on the 29th, what he calls a *reply*. Instead, however, of *replying* to my letter, he—1st—Places himself on the throne of the Omniscient, searches my heart, scans my motives, and gravely tells the world *that he is at no loss to discover the spirit and object of my petty compilation*. Secondly—He prefers against me a variety of charges. Thirdly—He forgives me; yet, fourthly, he will not *forget* me; for, fifthly, he will persecute me! Sixthly—He quotes from our standards—he quotes, for the *third time*, the 4th Sec. of the XX. Chapter of the Westminster Confession, a Section quoted by the enemies of Covenanters a thousand times. Seventhly—He interlards his whole letter with oblique insinuations.

Such are the contents of that epistle, which *The Covenanter* denominates a reply to my letter. Reply! In vain do we look for a reply. In his whole letter there is not *one single word* of a reply; and, indeed, I do not blame him for not replying, for probably he felt himself unable. I only blame him for calling his personal invectives, his heart-probings, his oblique insinuations, his free pardons, and his threatened persecutions, a reply.

From reading *The Covenanter's* letter, one would naturally conclude that I had given him great provocation. Now, what provocation have I given him? What offence have I committed? Did I, in my letter, descend to personalities? No. Did I apply

to his periodical one disrespectful epithet? No. What, then, have I done? How have I provoked him? Why, gentle reader, my crime is this: In the 7th, 8th, and 9th numbers of *The Covenanter*, I saw certain statements professing to exhibit the real and genuine principles of Covenanters—statements which I conceived to be erroneous, and regarded as exhibiting a very unfavourable view of the sentiments of our Church. To counteract the injurious effect of these statements, I extracted a few of them, and placed in juxta-position with them extracts from authentic documents published by the Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Ireland and the sister judicatory in Scotland. I added an extract from a pamphlet written by a Scotch Covenanting minister, and, because I had no other medium, I published these extracts in the columns of a newspaper. This is the head and front of my offending. *The Covenanter*, in his statements, contends—that the Civil Magistrate should punish an heretic or an idolater as well as a murderer or a traitor—that the laws against heresy and idolatry are no more repealed than those against robbery or murder—that gross and pestilent heresies should be suppressed, and suppressed by the sword of the Civil Magistrate, if no gentler means prove effectual. On the contrary, our supreme judicatories, our Synod in Ireland and sister judicatory in Scotland, declare—*that a merely passive toleration cannot be condemned—that permitting men to exist*, UNMOLESTED, *to hold their different opinions, without using external violence to make them change these*, CANNOT BE CONDEMNED—that, in the extirpation of error and heresy, *no force whatever* should be employed—that, to extirpate heresy by *fire and sword* is as absurd as *to punish a murderer by a syllogism*.

These are the counter-statements, which are exhibited more at large in my former letter. To those counter-statements I again solicit the attention of *The Covenanter*. I call upon him to reconcile them if he can. Till he do this, he has done nothing—my letter is unanswered. The reader will observe that the controversy is not between *The Covenanter* and me, but between *The Covenanter* and the Reformed Presbyterian Synods of Ireland and Scotland. If he attack these Synods by quotations from their standards, they are able to defend themselves. They have already repelled the attacks of their enemies when the very same weapons were wielded against them. Should *The Covenanter*, instead of replying by argument, resort again to personal invective, I shall neither retaliate nor imitate—my cause requires no such weapons. Should the discussion be continued, I will adopt another medium of communication.

JOHN PAUL.

December 18, 1831.

Mr. Paul, a few months after, wrote a *review* of *The Covenanter*, exposing what he regarded as persecuting principles advocated in that periodical, while *The Covenanter* still continued to advocate the same views on the duty and power of the Civil Magistrate to which objec-

tion had been made, and against which counter-testimony had been produced. At the meeting of Synod, held in Belfast in 1832, which was attended by delegates from the Reformed Presbyterian Synods of Scotland and America, the *Editor of the Covenanter* "exhibited a libel" against Mr. Paul—to use his own words—"for slander, misrepresentation, error, and disorderly procedure; and against Messrs. Alexander, Henry, C. Houston, and R. G. Orr, who had taken part with him in defamation or irregular procedure."

This paper was received by Synod and read publicly, but it was agreed that the whole matter should be held *in retentis* till the next annual meeting of Synod.

Before Mr. Paul's review was finished, *The Covenanter* published a sermon, entitled "The Christian Magistrate;" and while Mr. Paul and his associates were standing on a pillory, and could obtain no trial for a whole year, the Rev. T. Houston, Moderator of the Synod at that time, refused to call a *pro-re-nata* meeting of Synod, and published his own libel in *The Covenanter*. Shortly before the meeting of Synod in 1833, he published also *The Reviewer Reviewed*. Both the controversial sermon and the *Reviewer Reviewed* received a withering exposure from Mr. Paul.

In 1833, the Synod met at Moneymore, on July 9th, twelve o'clock noon. On the day of meeting it was arranged by the Court that the papers held *in retentis* since the last meeting of Synod, and those licensed to come before it at this meeting, do admit of a threefold classification—

I. Mr. Paul's complaint against the Northern Presbytery.

II. The charges brought by the Rev. Thomas Houston against Mr. Paul, connecting with him a number of members of the Eastern Presbytery.

III. The papers in which it is urged on the attention of the Court to judge of the merits of certain things contained in *The Covenanter*.

After discussion, it is arranged that the persons preferring the charges should speak in support of those charges; the accused party should reply; and that the persons bringing the charges should be heard in explanation, but should not be permitted to bring forward any new matter or new evidence; and that substantially the same course should be taken in the three cases.*

The parties in the first case having been heard, the Rev. William Anderson [from Scotland] is requested by the Synod to submit a resolution, which he would regard as declaratory of the judgment of the Court in this case. He accordingly moved, and it was seconded, "*That the Synod declare that it was disorderly on the part of the Rev. Thomas Houston to complain to the Northern Presbytery of the conduct of the Rev. John Paul, who was not under their jurisdiction, but as the Northern Presbytery seem to have been in a great measure ignorant of the design of the Rev. T. Houston, the Synod is satisfied that there was no intention on their part to violate the laws of the Presbyterian Church, or to usurp any authority over Mr. Paul.*"

It is moved by Mr. Fullerton, and seconded by a ruling elder, "*That we cannot disapprove of the conduct of the Northern Presbytery in this case.*"

Both motions are put, and the former is adopted.

In regard to the other two heads, after the different parties had spoken at length, it is agreed that the Rev. William Gamble should engage in prayer, for Divine direction in relation to the very important matters on which the Court is now to decide. After prayer, the Rev. Messrs. R. Cathcart, Stavely, Graham, and Anderson, with Messrs. R. Porter, J. Hemphill, J. Orr, and J. Graham, ruling elders, are appointed as a Committee,

* The report of the whole proceedings was published, and is exceedingly interesting, but is far too lengthy to be inserted here. The narrative here given is confined to what was published as an *Abstract* of the minutes of Synod for that year.

to retire for the purpose of drawing out a declaration expressive of the judgment of the Synod respecting the whole matter.

The Committee submit to Synod its report, which is unanimously adopted, viz.—

The Synod, after hearing the entire matter in dispute between the Rev. Thomas Houston and the Rev. John Paul, have adopted the following resolutions—the first series relating to doctrine, and the second relating to the conduct of the parties:—

I.

Resolved—1. This Synod declare that, by the appointment of the Father, our Lord Jesus Christ is Head over all things—all power in heaven and on earth being committed to Him.

2. That this authority is given to be exercised by Him as Mediator, for the benefit of His body, the Church, which is the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

3. That, according to this plain doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, our Lord Jesus Christ, as Mediator, is at once the King of Zion and the Prince of the Kings of the earth, and Governor among the nations.

4. That it is the duty of all people, nations, and languages, to serve Him, willingly acknowledging His authority over them, submitting to His law, and taking His holy Word as the infallible rule to guide their whole moral conduct, in every situation, and in all their different relations.

5. That it is the indispensable duty of nations, to whom the Word of God has come, to frame their constitutions of civil government in agreeableness to the revealed will of God; to set up as rulers over them, according to His command, persons Scripturally qualified, "able men, such as fear God—men of truth, hating covetousness;" to enact, in obedience to the Lord Jesus Christ, all their laws in conformity with the Holy Scriptures, for the glory of God, the benefit of civil society, the prosperity of the Church, the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom, and the happiness of mankind; and that, with these views, it is the duty of a Christian and Scripturally enlightened nation, in their national capacity, to employ all Scriptural means to support and promote true and undefiled religion, and to discountenance and suppress error, ungodliness, and immorality.

6. That upon these principles, it is the duty of the Christian magistrate, ruling in a Christian nation, to execute the wholesome and Scriptural laws established by the community, and according to the power vested in him as the minister of God for good, to exercise his office and employ his authority in a Scriptural manner for the good of the Church of Christ,

and in support of the authority both of the first and second tables of the Divine law.

7. That the Synod declare their continued and steadfast adherence to the subordinate standards of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, approving the great Scriptural principles of our Covenanted Reformation both in Church and State.

8. That it is matter of lamentation that the nations do not now submit themselves to Messiah, while it is matter of rejoicing that the time is coming when all dominions shall serve and obey Him; and, in the meantime, it is the imperative duty of the Church to hold forth to the world a distinct and explicit testimony in behalf of the duty of individuals and churches and nations submitting to His government, and obeying His laws; and the Synod consider that it would be injudicious and unwise, at the present time, to attempt entering into detail of the several things which ought to be done by the Christian magistrate at that happy period to which we look forward, believing assuredly that such matters will be easily determined at that future period of light and love.

9. The Synod further consider it their duty to declare that they abhor and condemn all persecuting principles; that they utterly disclaim the doctrine that religion may be propagated by force, or that men ought to be punished with death because they differ from us in opinion.

II.

Resolved—1. That the Rev. Thomas Houston, however good his intentions may have been, acted injudiciously in assuming the management of the periodical contemplated by Synod; and that, in having violated his compact with other ministers, whose assistance had been pledged, his conduct gave occasion to distrust and disorder.

2. That in case one minister felt hurt by statements made by another minister, he should have had recourse to the method of redress prescribed in Scripture; and we, therefore, most decidedly disapprove of Members of Synod writing in opposition to each other, as calculated to introduce confusion, and to bring Church government and discipline into contempt.

3. That the Rev. John Paul and the Rev. Thomas Houston, acquiescing in the above resolutions, we judge it inexpedient to specify more particularly our disapprobation of statements made, or conduct pursued, by either of the brethren in this matter.

4. That we are truly grateful to the Head of the Church that mutual explanation and candid discussions have preserved our testimony; and we trust that, under the direction of Him who is King of saints and nations, "the unity of the Spirit" will be preserved "in the bonds of peace."

These Resolutions having obtained the unanimous approbation of the Synod, the Rev. Thomas Houston handed in the following *acknowledgment*:—

"In relation to the publication of the heads of a libel, in

the 21st Number of *The Covenanter*, I declare, voluntarily, that though I, at the time, considered that step consistent with the ordinary practice of the periodical press, in furnishing information to the public, and it appeared to me to be called for in self-defence; and though I had not the smallest intention of injuring the persons whose names are mentioned in the paper, viz.—Rev. Messrs. Paul, Alexander, C. Houston, Henry, and R. G. Orr; yet, as the measure is regarded by my brethren in the ministry as doing them injury, I regret having taken it, and offer them the fullest apology. And, further, as an act of common justice, most willingly engage to give this acknowledgment the same publicity as was given to the former publication. (Signed),

"THOMAS HOUSTON,
Editor of *The Covenanter*."

In January, 1834, a new series of *The Covenanter* was commenced, under the joint-editorship of the Rev. T. Houston and Rev. James Dick, A.M., advocating, to a considerable extent, the same views that were exhibited in the first series, giving reports of Synod, and making observations, as seemed fit to the editors.

The meeting of Synod in 1834 was characterized by considerable harmony. Two official letters from the Church in America, addressed to the Synod, are read. In these there is reference to various other documents, which are laid on the table. After much discussion, it was agreed upon as an *intra* measure, that the Report of the Committee, appointed by the Synod in Scotland, and adopted by that Court, be recommended to this Synod for adoption.

The Report is too lengthy for insertion in these outlines. It was resolved by Synod—

"That we deeply deplore the division that has taken place in the Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; and that it is our earnest desire, as it has been in time past, to recognize, as brethren, those in all lands who maintain the principles of the Reformed Covenanted Church, with their proper application; and that, could we be instrumental in repairing the mournful breach, it would afford us the highest gratification; that, meanwhile, we suspend correspondence, and give over the whole matter to a Committee of Synod, who are enjoined to give special attention to it, and report at next meeting of Synod."

At the next annual meeting of Synod (1835), the Committee gave in their report.

After speaking of the *defects* and *immorality* of the Federal Government of the United States, they proceed to state—

"Your Committee find, in the procedure of the brethren in America, in the unhappy dispute that has been agitated among them, much to regret and deplore. They regret the degree of agitation that has been excited, and the personalities that have been mingled up with the controversy. They cannot approve of the publication of the disputed paragraphs of the Pastoral Address, in circumstances of such agitation, and after they had been judicially rejected. However much they approve of a calm and friendly discussion of every subject, they regard the time and circumstances in which the publication was emitted as unhappy. Your Committee also exceedingly regret the brethren in calling a *pro-re-nata* meeting of the Eastern Subordinate Synod, and disapprove of the precipitancy of its proceedings, and of its decisions in suspending their brethren from the exercise of office. Having under their consideration a question of general concernment to the Church, and having access to a General Synod, it appears to your Committee, that the Subordinate Synod should have deliberated and brought the matter before the Supreme Court. And withal, considering the connexion which the American Church has with the Churches in Scotland and Ireland, and the correspondence now between them, your Committee think that it was due to the importance of the subject, and to brotherly unity, and to prudence and safety, to have communicated with the Church in Europe.

"They regret exceedingly the apparent precipitation and irregularity of the Eastern Subordinate Synod, and cannot concur in the extreme measure resorted to, in suspending from office their brethren in the ministry.

"Your Committee are sorry that they cannot recommend any final decision on the subject, or even urge the Court to come to a final decision at all."

The report having been read, it is agreed that it be *received*. It is then moved by the Rev. S. Cameron, and seconded by Mr. H. Small, ruling elder (Belfast), that this report be adopted by the Synod. Moved, as *amendment*, by the Rev. T. Houston, and seconded by the Rev. Wm. Toland—

"That the two first resolutions of the Scottish Synod be adopted, but, in the meantime, as we owe a solemn duty to the friends of the Covenanted Reformation in America who anxiously look to us for direction, and also to our people who may emigrate to that land, we declare our belief, that, so far as we

can now judge, the brethren calling themselves the 'Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church,' of which the Rev. Robert Gibson is Moderator, and the Rev. Moses Roney, clerk, and those who adhere to them, retain the doctrine, discipline, and substantially the usuages which constituted the basis of our ecclesiastical fellowship, open correspondence with them; advise the other party, calling themselves 'A Reformed Presbyterian Synod,' to return to the testimony of the Church, and state decidedly that we can have no fellowship with any party, as the Covenanted Church in America, but on the footing of two principles expressed in '*Reformation Principles Exhibited*,' formerly sanctioned by the American Synod, namely—First, that there are moral evils essential to the Constitution of the United States, which render it necessary to refuse allegiance to the whole system. And, second, that the act respecting juries is absolutely prohibitory."

The discussion is continued for several hours, when the *amendment is withdrawn, and the original motion adopted.*

Ephraim Chancellor, ruling elder, desires his dissent to be recorded.

In 1836, the Synod in Ireland adopt the decisions of the Synod in Scotland, and the report founded on it. The Rev. Wm. Gibson (Coronery), desires his *dissent* to be recorded.

Among other things, the report adopted says :—

"The Synod do not feel themselves inclined, or able, or warranted, to interfere with the details of the unhappy dispute in which their brethren have been involved, or with the ecclesiastical proceedings which have been adopted. They have recommended, and they still earnestly recommend, to their brethren, mutual submission and conciliation in the spirit of the Gospel."

At the meeting of the Irish Synod, in the same year (1836), a memorial from some disaffected persons, wishing to withdraw from the Congregation of Newtonards, is laid before Synod.* Commissioners are heard in support of it, and Dr. Henry, and Mr. D. Jameson, Ruling Elder, in explanation of circumstances. It is moved and seconded—

* As the Pastor had but recently returned from America, perhaps some wolf in sheep's clothing had visited his flock in his absence.

"That these persons obtain certificates of their present standing from the Session, on settling their accounts with the Congregation, the boundaries of which are to remain unaffected by their removal."

Moved, as *Amendment*—

"That a Committee be appointed to investigate and adjudicate, at the place, on the whole matter."

After discussion, the amendment is withdrawn, and the motion passed.

At the same Synodical meeting, a Memorial from the Congregation of Knockbracken is read, in which Memorialists express their deep concern "to witness, in some quarters, principles avowed which appear to be opposed to the great doctrine of a national establishment of true religion, and which have a tendency to draw the members of the Church into an approval of the men and measures of the present civil administration in these lands."

Memorialists also "greatly lament the prevalence of a report that ministers and elders of the Reformed Presbyterian Church should, of late, have joined hands with those who impugn the doctrine of a national establishment of Christianity—and, moreover, ministers of the Church have been publicly declared to be engaged in conducting publications in which portions of our Westminster Standards are directly denied, or turned into ridicule, in which sanction is given to gross libels on the Standards and practice of the Reformed Church, and the article of a national establishment of true religion is opposed." Memorialists, moreover, "earnestly request Synod to make a public declaration to the Church and the world, of the doctrine of the Church respecting the duty of nations and civil rulers, to whom the light of Divine revelation comes authoritatively to establish the true religion, and to protect and support the Church of Christ."

Moved by Mr. Dick, and seconded by Mr. Smyth—

"That our religious profession and ordination vows imperatively demand of us, in the present circumstances of the Church, a distinct and solemn declaration, that, while we decidedly disapprove of existing civil and ecclesiastical establishments in these lands, we cannot make common cause with any of the political parties of the day, or with such as deny and oppose the principles of a national establishment of the religion of Jesus Christ. That we refer this petition to a Committee of Synod, with an express injunction to endeavour to have in readiness a matured report upon the subjects to which it relates; and that we affectionately beseech and warn all members of this Church to abstain from all acts contrary to the spirit of the foregoing declaration."

Moved, as *Amendment*, by Mr. Paul, and seconded by Dr. Henry—

"That this Synod resolve—

"I. We believe that a nation enjoying the light of Divine revelation is bound, in its national capacity, to embrace and protect the true religion, and extend to it its legal sanction and support. We, nevertheless, testify against the existing establishments of the British Empire.

"II. We believe that tythes have done immense mischief in Ireland, and should, therefore, be withdrawn from the Established Church, and devoted to national purposes.

"III. We believe that the Royal bounty, given to Presbyterian Ministers, is unjust and injurious, and ought to be withdrawn.

"IV. We believe that Prelacy, so far from being a bulwark between us and Popery, is, in reality, a principal support of Popery in Ireland. In no country in the world do *Roman Catholics* cling to their religion with so much tenacity, and tythes we believe to be one powerful cause."

After discussion, the motion is carried, thirty-one members voting for it, and eight members voting for the amendment.

Against the finding of Synod, Mr. Paul dissents, in his own name, and in the name of those who may adhere to him, and intimates his intention of assigning reasons in due time.

Adherents—Rev. W. Henry, D.D., Rev. C. Houston, Rev J. Alexander, Mr. James Adrain, Mr. David Jameson, Mr. John M'Vicker, Mr. Patrick Close.

Messrs. Dick, Alexander, Stuart, and Sweeney are ap-

pointed a Committee for receiving and reporting on the reasons for dissent.*

A memorial from the First Reformed Presbyterian Congregation, Belfast, had passed the Committee of Bills, and was to be laid before the Synod. The Court has not time to take under consideration the important subjects to which it relates; but it is agreed that early

* Mr. Houston, of Knockbracken, afterwards says—"The subjects referred to in the memorial [from his Congregation] were matters of deep importance, and such as could not be regarded with indifference by any who valued the Covenanted profession. The publication of the 'Causes of Fasting,' containing such sentiments as we have noticed—the circulation of the *Christian Liberator* throughout the Church—and the part that ministers and other members of Synod were reported to have taken in it—the attempts for the establishment of Voluntaryism—the public assistance which members of the Eastern Presbytery and their adherents rendered in the enterprise—were quite sufficient to excite alarm among those who were called to hold fast the truths to which the Church had already attained." And to excuse himself and his Congregation, and those who took part with them, from violating the brotherly covenant and maring the peace of the Church, he says—"This could not be considered in any sense, as violating the Synod's settlement of 1833," because the memorial "was exclusively in reference to new matter." The *Causes of Fasting* referred to, were published by the Eastern Presbytery as a supplement to former Causes, and contain a strong condemnation of Tythes and *Regium Donum*. But what was the object of the *Christian Liberator*, that Mr. Paul and some others were guilty of encouraging? Let the 1st number of that periodical speak for itself: —"The avowed and uncompromising advocates of truth, we have nothing to conceal. We proceed, therefore, to explain, candidly and fully, the leading position which we propose to illustrate and maintain. What is that position? That civil rulers have no concern with the Christian religion? That they are not bound to embrace it? to encourage it? to extend it? That they are not bound by solemn obligation to employ their personal, and even official, influence to diffuse its blessings among the communities over whom they preside? That they may with impunity refuse to devote their time, their energies, their influence, their property, to the promotion of its holy hallowed designs? No! We say, emphatically, no! We hold the principle, and we are prepared to defend it, that every prince and every potentate has a deep solemn concern in religion."

attention be given thereto, in the Synod's proceedings, at next annual meeting.

In 1837, the Synod met at Moneymore, when the memorial from the First Belfast Congregation was taken under consideration. Mr. John Newell, commissioner, is heard in support of it. Mr. James Morton, Elder from the Congregation, is also heard. The subject is brought before the Court for decision by the Moderator proposing the question—"Grant the petition or not." After the discussion has proceeded for some time, it is moved by Mr. Dick, and seconded by Mr. Smyth, *that this Synod do not judge it expedient to make any change, at this time, on the Fourth Term of Communion.*

Moved as *amendment*, by Dr. Paul,† and seconded by Dr. Henry, *that it be discretionary for each congregation to adopt the latter part of the Fourth Term of com-*

† In the October No. of the *Christian Liberator*, 1836, the following interesting notice appears:—"*American Academical Honours.*—It affords us no ordinary satisfaction to state that the long-established and highly respectable institution, called UNION COLLEGE, in the State of New York, recently conferred the honorary title of DOCTOR IN DIVINITY, on the REV. JOHN PAUL, of Carrickfergus. The trustees of UNION COLLEGE never conferred a higher honour on that Seminary, than on the day when they honoured our venerable friend, Dr. Paul. In addition to high literary eminence, and a profound acquaintance with Theological Science, he is an enlightened and powerful advocate of the sacred cause of civil and religious freedom. He has effectually exposed intolerance in some of his ministerial brethren, and his influence has been felt far beyond the bounds of his own Church. It was fitting, therefore, that an American College should confer honours which the bigotry and narrow-minded prejudice of our colleges at home prevented them from bestowing. We thank the Trustees of UNION COLLEGE for this prudent and honourable act. Let the trustees of other transatlantic colleges imitate their example; and, instead of conferring honours on those who delight in slandering their rising country, and calumniating its prosperous institutions, let them learn to give honour to those to whom it is due. We could name men who are D.D., by the grace of an American College, and yet America is by them injured, calumniated, slandered! Long may our honoured friend be spared to wear his merited honours."

munion, either as expressed in the form of the Church in Scotland or in that of the Church in Ireland. The discussion is continued to a late hour, when, the roll being called, the motion is carried, twenty-nine members voting for it, and eight members voting for the *amendment.* Against this finding Dr. Paul dissents, and intimates his intention of assigning reasons. It is agreed that an adjourned meeting of the Synod be held at Cullybackey on the second Tuesday of October, at 12 o'clock, noon, for taking up the unfinished business. An adjourned meeting was, accordingly, held at the time and place appointed. At this meeting, the Memorial from the First Reformed Presbyterian Congregation, Belfast, which was presented to Synod, at its Session of 1836, and respecting the first part of which the Court legislated, at last meeting, is read. Some time is spent in discussion, respecting the remaining parts of it, when it is moved by the Rev. J. Dick, and seconded by the Rev. A. Fullerton, that a Committee be appointed to revise the phraseology of the *Formulas* of questions proposed to ministers and elders at their ordination, and report to Synod. After discussion, the motion is *passed,* and, in the meantime, by the direction of the Court, it is distinctly declared, by the Moderator, to be the sense of the Synod, that it is *the acts of Assembly ratifying and approving the Reformation, during the period* between 1638 and 1649, that are intended in the *Formula.* It is reported that the DECLARATION to be prepared by a Committee is now in readiness. The document is now laid on the table, and read by the Clerk. It is moved by Mr. Ewing, and seconded by Mr. Gibson, that this DECLARATION be received as the Report of the Committee. The motion is *passed.** It is received first *in*

* This Declaration has not been improperly designated by some *The Dark Declaration.* It was said by a minister, not of the Eastern Presbytery, to be *unwieldy* and *unmanageable.*

moved by Rev. G. T. Ewing, and seconded by Rev. J. P. Sweany, "That all discussion on the papers now lying on Synod's table be suspended until the documents mentioned in the motion be submitted, for consideration to our inferior judicatories, and the result of their deliberations returned to Synod." Moved, as an amendment, by Rev. Wm. Toland, and seconded by Mr. S. Jackson, ruling elder, "That the Synod recommend to the consideration of the subordinate judicatories, the historical and doctrinal parts of the Testimony of the Scottish Reformed Presbyterian Synod, with a view to their adoption by this Church, and that the papers now lying on the Synod's table be held *in retentis* till the reports from the inferior judicatories be received and adjudicated." The roll is called, and the second motion is carried by a majority of twelve votes. The ministers and elders of the Eastern Presbytery desire their dissent to be recorded.

The Synod would give no certain sound on the subjects brought before them in the memorials presented, nor would the libels preferred by Dr. Paul against the Editors of *The Covenanter* before the Northern Presbytery be received by that Presbytery, but were *instantly rejected.* No redress could be obtained from either Presbytery or Synod. The Church had been agitated for about ten years. At length, in 1840, the following protest and Declinature, which speaks for itself, was read in Synod, and those who approved of it and joined in it withdrew:—

THE PROTEST AND DECLINATURE OF THE EASTERN PRESBYTERY.

"We, the undersigned Ministers and Elders of the Eastern Presbytery, and the Commissioners appointed to represent our respective congregations, do, in our own name, and in the name of all others who may see it their duty to join with us, protest against the pro-

ceedings, and decline the authority of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, for the following reasons:—

"I.—On account of the following errors:—

"1. Mr. Houston, in his *Covenanter*, No. xxvii., pp. 78-9, has grossly calumniated, not only our reforming forefathers, but also the present Reformed Presbyterian Church, by representing Covenanters as sworn to extirpate, not merely *principles*, but *persons*—not merely Popery and Prelacy, but Papists and Episcopalians, the members of the Churches of Rome and of England.

"In explaining Popery and Prelacy, he says:—'It may be remarked, that, by a figure of speech, familiar to every school-boy, and adopted in every language, the quality, good or evil, is frequently put for the subject to which it belongs, and the act for the agent. On the solid ground of Scripture analogy, we claim the figure in explaining the phrase in question.' So, then, by Popery, according to this figure, we are to understand Papists; and by Prelacy, Episcopalians. To prove that persons, as well as principles, ought to be extirpated, he says—'When our opponents challenge us to show how Popery, Prelacy, heresy, &c., can be extirpated by civil authority, we tell them, we are prepared to do so the instant they inform us how iniquity can be punished by the Judge.' According to this reasoning, as the Magistrate, in punishing iniquity, punishes the worker of iniquity, so, in extirpating Popery and Prelacy, he extirpates the persons of Papists and Episcopalians. Now, all this is a foul calumny on the venerable men who drew up the Solemn League and Covenant; for, in the very document itself, they assure us, that, by Prelacy, they understand Church government by Bishops, Archbishops, &c. To say, as Mr. Houston has done, that Covenanters are sworn to extirpate Roman Catholics and Episcopalians is a foul calumny on the Reformed Presbyterian Church. Our Synod, in a document published in 1823, declare that it is only *principles*, and not *persons*, that they would extirpate. They denounce the men who would say the contrary, as *men of perverse minds;* and they solemnly declare that they *would never use force of any kind to extirpate error*. In the face of all this, Mr. Houston has had the hardihood to publish to the world, that Covenanters are sworn to extirpate their neighbours, the members of the Churches of Rome and of England. And, what is still worse, he has published this calumny against his own Church, *knowing it to be a calumny!* for, on the floor of our Synod, in 1838, he publicly avowed that he admitted it into his periodical, in deference to a venerable member of our Synod, who is now no more. That such a calumny should be forged by our enemies, was a trying circumstance; but, that it should be raised from the grave after it had been buried, and that it should be widely and willfully circulated by a Minister of our own Church, is most distressing

"2. Mr. Houston will not only extirpate Roman Catholics, but he will extirpate them by putting them to death. Were the Reformed Presbyterian religion established, and were his own wife, or his children, or his friends, (or any other persons, males or females), to become Roman Catholics, he would not pity them, nor spare them, but would surely kill them; his own hands would be first upon them, and afterwards the hands of all the people, and he would stone them with stones till they died. Were the inhabitants of any city or town —suppose the inhabitants of Belfast or Ballymena—to become Roman Catholics, he would smite the inhabitants of that city or town with the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, men, women, children, and cattle. He would burn all the spoil of it with fire, and

would make a heap of it for ever. Such is the manner in which Mr. Houston would treat Roman Catholics and Roman Catholic towns and cities. This charge is an awful one; but out of his own mouth he stands condemned. The proofs are as follow:—

"*Christian Magistrate*, p. 93, he writes thus:—'The change of dispensation makes no change in the Divine law—the unalterable rule of faith and practice. Whatever was ceremonial, was done away in Christ; whatever is moral, is of perpetual obligation. Of the latter kind most evidently are the laws that guard the honour of both tables of the Decalogue.' Mr. Houston here asserts, that the judicial laws which punished idolaters with death were *moral* and of *perpetual obligation*. Page 91, speaking of the Christian Magistrate, he says:—'His duty is clearly and minutely declared in the words of Him who is without variableness or shadow of turning, and whose law, like Himself, is unchangeable. With this instrument in his hand he has nothing to fear. Let him apply it faithfully, and leave the consequences with God.' Page 70:—'The New Testament does define the Magistrate's province, and assigns him *the very same power* as was exercised by the Ministers of God who presided over the commonwealth of Israel. It assigns to him a sword, which he is not to bear in vain, and with which he is to execute wrath, as an avenger of God on him that doeth evil. Still, the inquiry may be repeated—are not gross heretics and idolaters of them that do evil? and, if so, has not the civil Magistrate a right guaranteed to him by God himself, to employ His authority in restraining them, and *executing wrath on them as flagrant transgressors of His law?*' *Covenanter*, vol. i., pp. 274-5:—'Indeed there is not a hint given in all the New Testament, that the judicial laws and the judicial decisions under the Mosaic dispensation were not to be referred to as examples or imitation in the Christian economy, when a similarity of circumstances might render such reference justifiable, nor that the laws against heresy, idolatry, &c., are repealed, any more than those concerning robbery or murder.' Page 209, vol. i:—'The civil Magistrate is to use his authority also in redressing the abuses committed against the first table, as well as against the second—that is to say, as well in punishing of a heretic, or an idolater, &c., as of a thief or a murderer, or a traitor.' *Ch. Mag.*, p. 55:—'We are warranted to regard the expression (terror to evil-doers) as attributing to the Christian civil Magistrate precisely the same power about religion as was claimed and exercised, with Divine approbation, under the former dispensation.' *Ch. Mag.*, p. 69:—'The New Testament proceeds on the principle, that specific directions had been before given relative to the Magistrate's duty on this article, and laws had been promulgated, which are never said to be repealed, and which must therefore be considered, on all fair construction, of continued obligation.' P. 16:—'The judicial law was an express code, specially given by the Divine Lawgiver himself, for the regulation of the civil affairs of the Hebrew commonwealth; and by it were the officers set over them required, *undeviatingly*, to abide in their awards and punishments, and in every other article of their administration.' P. 17:—'The reasons why those judicial laws, which guarded the Decalogue, are held to be still obligatory, are obvious. Such laws are moral in their nature,' &c. P. 117 with approbation he quotes the following sentiments:—'If the Magistrate, also, in the New Testament has the sword given him of God for the punishment of evil-doers, as Rom., xiii., 4, 5, that same law (*i. e.*, the judicial law for punishing heretics and idolaters) must now also have force. Except God was too rigorous and cruel in the Old Testa-

ment, (God avert such blasphemous thoughts!) whatever punishments were inflicted upon heretics, seducing prophets, idolaters, and apostates, these same stand yet in the plenitude of moral obligation, against such as offend in the New Testament, if the Magistrate bears the Lord's sword as he doth in the New Testament.' P 61: —'Being a revenger appointed to execute wrath upon them that do evil, he is to abide by the clear and explicit decisions of the Divine law.'

"According to the judicial law against idolatry, as it is recorded in the 13th chapter of Deuteronomy, men were to stone to death the wives of their bosoms, their sons their daughters, their brethren, and their friends who were dear to them as their own souls. If they became idolaters, they were forbidden to spare, pity, or conceal them; they were enjoined to kill them; their own hands were to be first upon them, and afterwards the hands of all the people. And, when cities became idolatrous, the law was, to cut off all their inhabitants —men, women, children, and cattle—with the edge of the sword. The cities themselves, and all their spoils, were to be burned with fire and never rebuilt. Such were the laws against idolatry, such were the laws which Mr. Houston maintains are moral, and of perpetual obligation. He contends, as appears from the quotations above, that these laws are no more repealed than the laws against robbery and murder. He assures us, the punishment specified in these laws stand *in the plenitude of moral obligation*. The latter phrase he exhibits in italics, to show that there is to be no mitigation. Mr. Houston believes and teaches, that idolaters should be treated with as much severity under the Christian, as under the legal economy. But, Mr. Houston being judge, Roman Catholics are idolaters, and therefore, Roman Catholics should be punished with as great severity. This is the inevitable conclusion. In a reformed country, when men's brethren, or sons, or daughters, or the wives of their bosoms, or their friends who are dear to them as their own souls, become Roman Catholics they should put them to death without mercy. And the inhabitants of Roman Catholic cities they should hew to pieces with the edge of the sword; they should burn those cities, and make a heap of them for ever. This is the doctrine taught by Mr. Houston, and circulated by him through the British Empire, and Continent of America. If Mr. Houston believes what he says, and repeatedly teaches and inculcates, he could not be less severe than described above. On the contrary, he would be *more severe*. He does not think the above treatment severe at all. He regards it as comparatively mild. He thinks that the punishments under the Gospel should be more severe than those under the law. In his *Christian Magistrate*, p. 121, he writes thus:—'The legal economy, as far as the correction and punishment of sin were concerned, was distinguished by *forbearance* rather than *severity*.' And, in his *Covenanter*, vol. i, p. 272, showing how the sword of the Civil Magistrate should be used now under the Gospel, he quotes Heb. x, 28-9: —'He that despised Moses's law, died without mercy, under *two or three witnesses*. Of how much *sorer punishment* suppose ye shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God,' &c.? From this it would seem, that Mr. Houston would not be content with stoning Roman Catholics to death, or hewing them to pieces: he appears to think, that *a rarer punishment* should be inflicted on them.

"3. Mr. Houston not only maintains, that the judicial laws against idolaters are in full force under the Gospel, but he maintains, also, as appears from the preceding quotations, that the power of the

Civil Magistrate, in matters of religion, is precisely the same as that which he claimed and exercised, with Divine approbation, under the law; and, particularly, he insists, that the same punishments should be inflicted on idolaters now, as were inflicted then. Let us apply these principles. What punishment was inflicted on those that worshipped the golden calf? It is thus described—Exod., xxxii., 27:—'Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out, from gate to gate, throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbour. And the children of Levi did according to the word of Moses; and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men. For Moses had said, consecrate yourselves to-day unto the Lord, even every man upon his son, and upon his brother, that He may bestow upon you a blessing this day.' Moses did this with Divine approbation; and Mr. Houston tells us, that the same punishment should be inflicted on idolaters now. In other words, he tells us, that the same punishment should be inflicted on Roman Catholics. This punishment, he assures us, *stands in the plenitude of moral obligation.*

"Again, how did Jehu treat the idolatrous Priests of Baal? He said—'Ahab served Baal a little, but Jehu shall serve him much.' He proclaimed a solemn assembly for Baal. He assembled all the Priests of Baal. He ordered them vestments; and, when the house of Baal was filled with these Priests, and when these Priests had made an end of sacrificing to Baal, Jehu issued the following orders:—'Go in and slay them: let none come forth. And they smote them with the edge of the sword.'—2nd Kings, x., 10—29. In this manner did Jehu punish Hebrew idolaters, and, in the same manner would Mr. Houston's Christian Magistrate punish *Popish idolaters.* He would bring into St. Patrick's Cathedral all the Popish Priests; and, after they had celebrated High Mass, he would give orders to the soldiery to mingle their blood with their sacrifices. Mr. Houston assures us, that whatever punishment was inflicted on idolaters, under the *Old Testament*, stands in the plenitude of moral obligation, under the *New Testament.* The Magistrate has the same power now that was claimed and exercised, with Divine approbation, then. This is his doctrine. Nor would there be any severity in this, for he assures us, that the 'legal economy, as far as the correction and punishment of sin were concerned, was distinguished by forbearance, rather than severity;' and he assures us, moreover, that transgressors now are worthy of *sorer punishment.*

"Mr. Houston holds up Josiah as an example to Christian Magistrates. Now, how did Josiah treat idolaters? In 2nd Kings, xxiii., 20, we read thus:—'*And he slew all the Priests of the high places that were there upon the altars, and burnt men's bones upon them, and returned to Jerusalem.*' Mr. Houston's Christian Magistrate would treat Popish Priests in the very same manner. He would slay them on their altars; and, by burning men's bones upon those altars, he would defile and pollute them. In this way would Mr. Houston's Christian Magistrate imitate the zeal of the good Josiah.

"Joshua was another Magistrate who punished idolaters. He cut off, by the sword, seven nations of idolaters. Mr. Houston maintains, that the Christian Civil Magistrate should imitate this example. In his Christian Magistrate, pp. 75-6, he quotes, with approbation, the following sentiments:—'Whatsoever God required of the Civil Magistrate in Israel and Juda, concerning the observation of true religion, during the time of the law, the same doth He require of lawful Magistrates, professing Christ Jesus in the time of

the Gospel. I fear not to affirm, that the Gentiles be bound by the same covenant that God made with his people Israel, in these words: Beware that thou make not any covenant with the inhabitants of the land, but thou shalt destroy their altars, &c. When, therefore, the Lord putteth the sword in the hand of a people, they are no less bound to purge their cities and countries from idolatry, than were the Israelites what time they received the possession of the land of Canaan.' God required Joshua to cut off the idolatrous Canaanites, and he requires the Christian Magistrate to cut off the idolatrous Roman Catholics. This is the plain inference. When God put the sword into the hand of Joshua, he purged the land of Canaan from idolatry, by cutting off the Canaanites. And, when God put the sword into the hand of King William, he should have purged the British Empire from idolatry, by cutting off the Papists. Such is the doctrine taught by Mr. Houston. His language not only justifies this conclusion—it does much more: it authorises us to conclude that Protestants, whenever God puts the sword into their hands, are, in every country, bound to exterminate Roman Catholics; and not only Roman Catholics, but all *other* idolaters! Whatever God required of Magistrates, under the law, He requires of them still under the Gospel. This is Mr. Houston's doctrine. But he required of Magistrates, under the law, to cut off whole nations of idolaters: therefore, he requires of Magistrates *now* to cut off whole nations. Nor would there be any severity in this, if we believe Mr. Houston; for he assures us, that 'the legal economy, as far as the correction and punishment of sin were concerned, was distinguished by *forbearance* rather than *severity*.

"Nehemiah punished those who entered into matrimonial alliances with idolaters. He 'contended with them, and *cursed* them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair.' He did all this with Divine approbation; and, of course, Mr. Houston's Christian Magistrate should do the same. The Christian Magistrate should *curse* the people that violate God's law by marrying Papists. Such is the doctrine of the Rev. T. Houston.

"4. Mr Houston not only teaches, that the judicial laws against idolaters are still in force against Papists, and that all the punishments inflicted on idolaters, under the Old Testament, with Divine approbation, should be inflicted on Papists under the *New*; he maintains, still farther, *that the penal laws enacted against Papists*, at the time of the Reformation, *ought to be executed in their full extent and latitude*. In his *Christian Magistrate*, p. 81, he laments that these laws are not executed. He quotes, with approbation, the following acknowledgment of sin:—'And, not only then, but even to this day, there is too much conniving at Papists; the laws are not put in execution against them *in their full extent and latitude*.'

"Now, what were these laws? They were numerous. The following are a specimen:—By the 5th Act, 1 Par., Jac. VI., the sayers or hearers of Mass, or such as are present thereat, are punished by confiscation of all their goods, moveable and immoveable, and an arbitrary punishment of their persons for the first fault—banishment for the second—and death for the third. Continuing in the practice of going on pilgrimages to Kirks, Chapels, crosses, or the like, was punishable with death. Continuing in the practice of keeping saints' days was punishable with death. Continuing in the practice of singing carols within and about Kirks, or the observance of other Papistical superstitious rites, was punishable with death. The person who would seize a Priest or Jesuit, a trafficking Priest, or their resetters, was to obtain a reward of 500 merks. The person

who would keep a Popish servant was to be fined in 500 merks. A Popish son, who thought his father lived too long, being anxious to inherit his estate, had nothing to do but to turn Protestant; by this simple process, he might turn ou his aged parents, and take possession of their property.—See 'Stuart's Collections,' pp 123-4-5, in which a multitude of other penal laws are specified.—See, also, Preface to Carlile's Sermons against Popery. Mr. Houston laments that these penal laws are not executed, in their full extent and latitude. He confesses it as a great national sin, that Papists are not punished with confiscation of goods, corporal punishment, banishment, and death.

"6. According to the doctrine taught by Mr. Houston, Methodists should be put to death, and Quakers should be put to death, as well as Socinians, Arians, Deists, and Atheists. All heretics should be put to death, if his doctrine be true. In his *Covenanter*, vol. i., p. 26, speaking of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland and Ireland, he says:—'The Arminian heresy very generally prevails through the whole length and breadth of her pale.' And, in the very next sentence, he denominates Arminianism a *pestilential* heresy. And, in vol. ii., p. 68, he styles it a *soul-destroying* heresy. Now, if Arminianism be a pestilential, soul-destroying *heresy*, Arminians are pestilential, soul-destroying *heretics*. But Mr. Houston assures us, as we have alre dy seen, that the judicial laws against heresy and idolatry are no more repealed than those against robbery and murder. There are, however, *no such laws*. In the whole Word of God, there is neither *precept* nor *example* for punishing heretics, but Mr. Houston tries to bring them under the judicial laws, by identifying them with idolatry and false prophets. In his *Christian Magistrate*, p. 65, he writes thus:—'In Deut. xiii., 16, false prophets, *teaching lies*, or *propagating heresies* in the name of the Lord, are declared punishable by the civil Magistrate.' See, also, p. 68, where he identifies false prophets and heretical teachers. Heretics are identified with idolaters, *Reviewer Reviewed*, p. 54, in the following words: 'It is quite apparent, that all those false teachers of old, who aimed to withdraw the Israelites from the worship of the true God, and to cause them to go after other gods, were regarded by the law as heretics.' Mr. Houston is guilty of error in teaching, that the false prophet and heretic are identical, and that the idolater and the heretic are identical. The error in both cases we exposed on the floor of our Synod, in '38. But our present charge is, that, if heretics and idolaters are the same, and if heretics and false prophets are the same, as Mr. Houston maintains, then they should be punished with the very same punishment. But idolaters and false prrophets were punished with death, and, therefore, heretics should be punished with death. Arminians are heretics, and, therefore, Arminians should be put to death. Wesleyan Methodists, being Arminians, and consequently pestilent, soul-destroying heretics, should be put to death. Quakers, for the same reason, should be put to death. All the Arminians in the General Assembly of Scotland, or under its inspection, should be put to death. All the Arminians in the Synod of Ulster, or under its inspection should be put to death. All the Arminians in the Established Church of England or Ireland should be put to death. They are all pestilential, soul-destroying heretics—they are all idolaters and false prophets—and, therefore, they should all be put to death.

"Mr. Houston assures us, that 'whatever punishment, under the Old Testament, was inflicted upon *heretics*, seducing prophets, idolaters, &c., the same stands yet in the plenitude of moral obligation.'

In his speech against Dr. Paul, in prosecution of his libel, Mr. Houston charged him with heresy; and, therefore, if his doctrine be true, Dr. Paul should be put to death. With these bloody principles we charge Mr. Houston.

"6. In punishing heresy and idolatry, Mr. Houston would invest the civil Magistrate with *arbitrary powers*. He would authorize him to inflict *whatever punishment he pleased*. In his *Christian Magistrate*, p. 73, he writes thus:—'The kind of restraint or punishment, we allege, should be left to be determined by the Christian wisdom of the Magistrate, and by the circumstances of the case. In a nation professing and establishing the true religion, it would *be a question for the Judges*.' And, in his *Reviewer Reviewed*, pp. 48 and 49, he says: '*The Covenanter* has only maintained the general principle, that gross heresy and idolatry should be suppressed by the Magistrate's authority, leaving the nature or degree of punishment, in particular cases, to be afterwards determined *by the Judges*.' Now, according to this doctrine, the Judge might order Papists or heretics to be either hanged, burnt, or flayed alive. He might inflict upon them all the tortures invented either by the Sicilian tyrants, or the Popish Inquisitors. We have seen that Mr. Houston would put Arminians to death. He would inflict the same death (stoning or slaying with the sword) as was inflicted by the judicial law on idolaters and false prophets. Of course, he would inflict a more dreadful death on Papists, Socinians, Arians, &c.; the death to be inflicted, or the tortures that might precede it, would be questions for the Judges. Such is the religious liberty which Mr. Houston would allow in a nation professing the true religion!

"7. The Rev. Thomas Houston would not only extirpate Popery and Prelacy—he would extirpate every sect and denomination of Christians who differ from him in religious opinions. Nay, more, all errors whatever, according to him, are punishable by the sword of the civil Magistrates. If they are published, they are punishable. In his *Christian Magistrate*, p. 56, he says:—'The doctrine which I have endeavoured to establish, respecting the duty of the civil Magistrate to advance the true religion, teaches, by immediate inference, that it is equally his duty to restrain and repress, by his authority, and whatever means are competent to him, all that endangers the Church's peace or safety, or is opposed to the power of godliness.' P. 32:—'Let them (the Magistrates) fearlessly oppose and cast out of the State whatever is contrary to the Divine honour, and would obscure the manifestation of the Divine glory.' P. 59:—'If the nation professes the true religion, and publicly declares, by the sanction of the civil Magistrate, its approbation of the Church's creed, then it is abundantly evident that whatever tends to tarnish the Divine glory, and is manifestly detrimental to the interests of the truth professed, becomes a civil offence, and is justly entitled to be visited with penal inflictions.' According to these sentiments, Magistrates should punish 'whatever endangers the Church's peace;' but all errors endanger the Church's peace, and, therefore, he should punish *all errors*. He should punish whatever endangers *the Church's safety*; but all errors endanger the Church's safety, and, therefore, he should punish *all errors*. He should punish whatever is opposed to the power of godliness; but all errors are opposed to the power of godliness, and, therefore, he should punish *all errors*. Whatever tends to tarnish the Divine glory is a civil offence; every error tends to tarnish the Divine glory, and, therefore, every error is a civil offence, and is justly entitled to be visited by penal inflictions. Whatever is detrimental to the truth

professed is a civil offence; but every error is detrimental to the truth professed, and, therefore, every error is a civil offence, and is justly entitled to be visited with penal inflictions. *All err, and, therefore, all should be visited with penal inflictions. Reviewer Reviewed*, p. 51:—'He is bound to restrain and punish whatever is clearly condemned in the Divine law;' but all error and sin are so condemned, and should therefore be punished. Such is Mr. H.'s penal code. The Magistrate, he assures us, should 'fearlessly oppose and cast out of the State whatever is contrary to the Divine honour;' but all error and all sin are contrary to the Divine honour, and therefore he should fearlessly oppose, and cast out of the State, all error and all sin. But how he could do this, without the extirpation of the whole human family, we leave your Rev. Court to determine.

"8. Mr. Houston maintains the propriety of propagating the true religion by the sword of the civil Magistrate. In his *Covenanter*, No. xiii., p. 7, he says—'There is indeed no hardship imposed in requiring a profession of the Christian religion, and as little in requiring its professors to support it, since both are duties mankind have no right to evade; nor can they neglect them, without openly rebelling against the God that made them.' 'Civil Magistrates should exert their influence and authority, that the true religion may be received and professed by all within their dominions.'—*Covenanter*, vol. i., p. 232. At p. 8, he proceeds thus:—'It is nevertheless his duty to see that pure Christianity be publicly professed by his subjects, and that a liberal support be administered to them that serve at the altar.' And, p. 84, he says—'Our holy religion is firmly established by its Divine Author, to the absolute exclusion of every other scheme: the Magistrate, of course, can add nothing to its authority, and has only to suppress whatever is directly opposed to it.' According to these sentiments, the civil Magistrate should require Jews, Heathens, Mahomedans, Deists, and Atheists, to become Christians. And, if he have a right to *require* them to become Christians, he has a right *to enforce the requisition by pains and penalties.* The requisition of a Mag strate, without a penalty to enforce it, would be worse than nugatory. It would bring his authority into contempt. It is the duty, therefore, of the civil Magistrate, to force men, by pains and penalties, to *profess the Christian religion, and to pay for its support.* In other words, the religion of Jesus Christ should be propagated by the sword of the civil Magistrate.

"9. Mr. Houston's civil Magistrate would force men to be religious. He would compel them, on pain of death, to seek the Lord God of Israel. 2d Chron., xv., 12, 13—'And they entered into a covenant to seek the Lord God of their fathers, with all their heart and with all their soul: that whosoever would not seek the Lord God of Israel, should be put to death, whether small or great, whether man or woman.' Asa and his subjects entered into this covenant with Divine approbation; and, therefore, according to Mr. Houston's doctrine, the Christian civil Magistrate and his subjects should do the same. His Magistrate would put to death great and small, men and women, who neglect to seek God.

"10. Mr. Houston's civil Magistrate would appoint Church officers, depose Church officers, and regulate the public worship of God. He has the same power now about matters of religion that he had and exercised, with Divine approbation, under the legal economy. David regulated the course of the Priests, the Levites, and the singers; and Solomon deposed Abiathar, the High Priest, and substituted Zadoc in his room. Now, if Mr. Houston's doctrine be true,

the Christian civil Magistrate might exercise similar authority in ordering and regulating the New Testament Church.

"11. That Mr. Houston's sentiments are grossly Erastian, the following quotations abundantly prove:—

"*Cov.*, vol. i., p. 209, he quotes, with approbation, the following sentiments:—'The Magistrate is, in a civil nation, the supreme Governor; *in all causes ecclesiastical*, it belongs to him, by his political power, *to reform the Church when corrupted*'—to suppress idolatry, heresy, &c.—to punish Church officers with civil punishment, when they abuse their power—*the King is to judge of heresy*, but after a regal and civil way, and *with co-active power*. P. 210—'Yea, also as Church officers they are to be kept within the limits of their calling, and compelled, if need be, by the Magistrate, to do these duties, which, by the clear Word of God, and the received principles of the Christian religion, or by the received ecclesiastical constitutions of the Church, they ought to do.' *Reviewer Reviewed*, p. 42, he quotes, with approbation, thus:—'He hath a co-active power over all men, even Pastors, as to cause them to do their Christian duties: he hath a power to compel Churchmen, in assemblies, to determine truth, and to use the keys right, and to preach and use the sacraments according as Christ hath commanded in His Word, and to *punish them* when they do otherwise. But, certainly, the King's civil, kingly, co-active power, to compel men to do their duty, remaineth the highest and most supreme power on earth, *in genere potestatis politicæ*, in the kind of political power; and pastors and all men may, by this power, be compelled to do right. In this kind, the King hath both a negative, politic, and kingly suffrage and voice in all Church assemblies'—p. 44. His Majesty is the supreme civil Governor over all persons, and in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil. These are a few specimens of Mr. Houston's Erastianism. We submit them to the consideration of your Rev. Court, and entreat you to purge this leaven out of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

"12. To support the Clergy, Mr. Houston would lay upon the people most oppressive burthens.

"In his *Covn.*, vol. ii., p. 87, he claims for the Clergy, and for the support of religion, all that has ever been given, or shall, in times coming, be given for the use of the Kirk. Now, at the time of the Reformation. one-half, if we have been correctly informed, of the wealth of Europe was Church property. All this he would claim for the support of the Clergy, and for the support of religion. And, in his *Christian Magistrate*, p. 46, he pleads for a tithe system, immensely more oppressive than was ever imposed by Popery or Prelacy—a tithe not only of the produce of lands, but of the *products of industry*. All this, he assures us, would not be too much. In addition to all this he declares, that he would accept 'private contributions to the utmost extent to which they can be procured.'—See *Cov.*, No xviii., p. 269. Although the Clergy of the Reformed Presbyterian Church are, probably, the most self-denied Clergy in the world, yet, if judged according to Mr. Houston's claims, they must be regarded as the *most greedy and avaricious* Clergy on the face of the earth. We implore your Reverend Court to repel this calumny, and to wipe off this foul stain from the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

"13. Mr. Houston maintains the long-exploded error, that dominion is founded in grace. He maintains, that neither a Heathen Magistrate nor a Christian Magistrate, unless he be possessed of true piety and vital godliness, should be acknowledged as a lawful Magistrate.

"In the 24th page of his *Christian Magistrate*, he writes thus:—'The Magistrate who rules over men, must be just, ruling in the fear of the Lord. There is a moral necessity that he should possess these qualifications; without them *his authority is at an end, and conscientious submission is not his due.*' 'If this be the case *generally*, much more may it be incontestibly shown, that Scriptural qualifications are indispensable to the character of Magistracy among a Christian people.' In p. 26, he explains the fear of God as comprehending *the whole of vital religion*. After quoting Scripture, to establish this point, he says—'These Divine testimonies expressly declare, that the person who fills the chair of Magistracy, to be acknowledged to be a rightful ruler by a Christian people must be a *pious* man. In his heart the leaven of vital godliness must be extensively diffused,' &c. According to these quotations, if a Magistrate is not a pious man, he cannot be a lawful Magistrate. This, he assures us, is the case *generally*, but much more so in the case of a Christian Magistrate. Though piety and godliness have always been regarded as of great and paramount importance, yet, to make saintship a term of communion *in the Church*, or to make it essential to the *ministerial character*, or a condition *sine qua non*, has always been condemned as an error by Reformed Presbyterians. How much greater then is the error of Mr. Houston, who makes it essential to the character of the *civil Magistrate?* It is an error opposed to Scripture, to reason, and to our Westminster Confession, which says (we understand the quotation as explained by the Covenanters), 'Infidelity or difference of religion does not make void the Magistrate's just and legal authority,' &c.

"In page 32, he says, 'But we must go farther, and declare, that the man who discovers not a deep concern for the advancement of the Divine glory, and employs not whatever influence he possesses for this end, cannot be received by a Christian people as God's *Minister*, and his authority cannot be acknowledged as the ordinance of God.

"This sentiment, under the specious appearance of great piety and zeal for the glory of God, sweeps, by one stroke, all civil government from the face of the earth. No *man* ever existed, no *Magistrate* ever existed, who emyloyed *all his influence* for the glory of God. All men and all Magistrates sin, and come short of the glory of God. And, therefore, there never was, and, we may add, there never will be, a lawful Magistrate on the face of the earth. Mr. H.'s doctrine deposes them all. It is subversive of all civil government whatever. It is a complete anti-government scheme.

"14. Mr. Houston rests the truth of our standards on *the character of the men who composed them*, instead of resting it on the *firm basis of Divine revelation*. In his *Covenanter*, vol. ii., p 325, he writes thus:—'In establishing the Scriptural character of the doctrine of our standards, we shall proceed rather in the line of presumptive, than of direct and demonstrative, proof—inferring the fact from the character of the compilers, the advantages under which they executed the work, and the very general approval of it, on the part of the Orthodox Churches. Thus, detail will be avoided, brevity secured, and *a strong enough case*, we trust, made out.' No, no; no case will be strong enough which is not proved from the sacred oracles. A strong enough case is made out for implicit faith, but nothing more. The Church of Rome might be satisfied with such proof, but Protestants are not. Their faith rests not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God. The Church of Rome appeals to the Fathers for the truth of their doctrines; Mr. Houston does the

same. The Church of Rome mangles the Fathers, so does Mr. Houston. The Church of Rome, by the *Index Expurgatorious*, strikes out of the Fathers those passages that do not please her. Mr. Houston uses the same pious fraud. In his *Christian Magistrate*, p. 117, he applies the *Index Expurgatorious* to Rutherford. When Rutherford declares, that the punishments of the Old Testament, against heretics, idolaters, &c., 'stand in the plenitude of moral obligation, *even to blood and death*.' Mr. Houston, mangling Rutherford, strikes out the phrase *blood and death*. Will the pious frauds of the Church of Rome be tolerated in the Reformed Presbyterian Church?

"15. Mr. Houston does every thing in his power to subvert the whole fabric of the Protestant religion, by endeavouring to tear away the main pillars on which it rests—the right of private judgment, and free enquiry. In his *Christian Magistrate*, p. 271, he writes thus:—'Enthusiasts may cry out against this guardian care of *The Magistrate*, as oppressive and tyrannical; but there is no reason whatever for such a complaint, since no individual has a right to set up his own opinion, in opposition to the established sentiments of society.' Vol. ii., p. 296—'It is of the nature of the vow to put it out of the power of the party contracting to change his purpose lawfully.' No. for Jan., 1835, p, 20—'To those who are in the Church, whether officers or people, we say—You are bound to maintain, not to canvass, the doctrines—to adorn, not to call in question, the received principles of the Church's testimony; you can claim no right, after having made vows, to make inquiry how you may break them.' Vol. ii., p. 209—'The principles of the Society being known, and the union voluntary, the individual members can have no colour of pretence for disturbing the peace and endangering the existence of the Society, by avowing contradictory opinions.' These sentiments condem all our Reformers, all Protestants, and all Dissenters. They had no right, according to Mr. Houston, to set up their own opinions, in opposition to the established sentiments of society. They had no right to break their vows—they had no right 'to avow contradictory opinions'—in a word, they had no right to become either Protestants or Dissenters. These sentiments we submit to your Rev. Court, are downright Popery.

"16. Mr. Houston maintains, that 'parental government is the proper model for civil government; and that what the head of a Christian family may do, the Magistrate, the civil father of the State, may do in his official station.'—*Reviewer Reviewed*, p. 53. In his *Covenanter*, p. 332, he writes thus:—'The domestic constitution we are disposed to consider a good model for the civil—the head of the State, in a well ordered community, being to his subjects what a father is to his family.' P. 303:—'When the individual becomes the father of his people, and being, by name, a Christian, and appointed over a community professing Christianity, he is just bound to act like the head of the family.' This is downright despotism. A father may correct his child for spilling its milk—for soiling its clothes—for not using its pocket-handkerchief; but can the civil Magistrate do the same? The father of a family may dismiss his servant for the smallest fault, or without any fault at all. Has the civil Magistrate the same power? When the father turns off his servant, may the Magistrate, imitating his example, send him out of the kingdom? As the father controls his family, and constrains the members of it to attend family worship, may the civil Magistrate compel them to attend the worship of the Established Church? We might put a thousand questions of a similar kind, for there are

thousands of things which a father may do, which would be downright tyranny and despotism were the Magistrate to do them. The Autocrat of Russia, the Grand Seignior, or the greatest despot that ever breathed would be gentle as a lamb compared with Mr. H.'s Christian Magistrate, who would act on the principle, that 'what the head of a Christian family may do, the Magistrate may do in his official station'

"On account of the above errors, with which your Reverend Synod have identified yourselves by refusing to condemn them, we decline your authority.

"II. We decline the authority of your Reverend Court, on account of the untruths, falsehoods, and calumnies with which we have been loaded, and our characters aspersed. These calumnies and falsehoods are exceedingly numerous. You refuse to condemn them, or even to examine them. You refuse to call our calumniators to account. Under your jurisdiction, we have no protection for our characters. We are, therefore, forced to decline your authority. As a specimen of these calumnies we refer to Dr. Paul's libels against the Rev. Messrs. T. Houston and James Dick. In these libels, upwards of 150 untruths and calumnies are specified.

"III. We decline the authority of your Reverend Court, on account of all the other grounds of complaint stated in the memorials from our congregations and Sessions. For these grievances—grievances which we consider as quite intolerable—you refuse to give us any redress. You will not even hear our complaints. You will not allow our papers containing these complaints to be read in open Court. You have thrown them out in the Committee of Bills. When papers were laid on your table, charging one of your members with an immense number of slanders and calumnies, you passed a law, that these papers should be held *in retentis*; and, of course, that the calumniated Ministers should lie under these calumnies, without any redress, till the reports of the different Sessions on the Scottish Testimony be given in and adjudicated on. This might occupy many years. The Scottish Synod were eighteen years in coming to a decision on their Testimony, and there is no security that the Irish might not require the same period. During all this time our calumniated Ministers, if they lived so long, would be obliged to stand on a pillory, without any opportunity of vindicating their characters. They have stood on that pillory during a series of years, and are determined to stand no longer. By your conduct, stated in the aforesaid memorials, you have left us no alternative but to decline your authority.

"IV. We decline the authority of your Reverend Court, because you will neither condemn the errors circulating in our Church, nor suffer us to condemn them. You will neither defend us from calumny, nor suffer us to defend ourselves. You will not suffer one Minister to write against another, but you will suffer one Minister to calumniate another. For whole torrents of abuse poured out during a series of years, the calumniated Ministers can obtain no redress. We are thus forced to decline your authority. The vindication of truth compels us—the defence of our own character compels us—to decline your authority, and withdraw from your jurisdiction. Division in our Church we regard as most lamentable. We greatly deplore it. We have done every thing in our power to prevent it, but we cannot avoid it. It is forced on us. In renouncing your jurisdiction, we do not renounce our principles. That we have renounced our principles, is one of those calumnies of which we complain. In withdrawing from you, we do not withdraw from the

Reformed Presbyterian Church. We challenge our calumniators to point out one single principle of the Church's Testimony which we have relinquished. We have denounced persecution, but not more distinctly than the Synod in 1823 denounced it. With those Covenanters who think that the civil Magistrate should punish heretics and idolaters, we would have borne for some time, but they would not bear with *us*. Their Ministers have denounced us as New Light innovators and apostates; and they believe their Ministers, and act accordingly. They have virtually excommunicated us, and torn asunder the bonds of union. *You* are in a state of actual separation. We can obtain no fellowship but that which is calculated to injure the interests of religion. In all this you are acting disorderly; and, from such brethren as you, we are commanded to withdraw. In obedience to this Divine injunction, with sorrowful hearts, we *do* withdraw. But whilst, under the influence of imperious necessity, we withdraw from actual communion with our erring brethren, we do not withdraw from them our affectionate regards. Our heart's desire and prayer to God for them shall be, that they may be saved. We are quite aware that the error of many of the laity is altogether involuntary—that they are more to be pitied than blamed—that they have only seen one side of the question. The other has been studiously kept out of view. They believed what their Ministers told them. They could not think that men, sanctimoniously talking of the blood of martyrs, would be capable of publishing calumnies almost innumerable. Seeing every thing, therefore, through a false medium, we do not think it strange they should act as they have done. Under these circumstances, whilst we withdraw from those who walk disorderly, we do not mean to count them as enemies, but to admonish them as brethren. As God shall enable us, we will endeavour to undeceive them, by explaining our principles, and defending our characters from the slanders and calumnies by which they have been assailed. We have no doubt at all that every effort will be made to keep them in ignorance. Some may submit to be muffled in this manner; but we have reason to hope, that a considerable number will be inclined to show their sense of justice, by hearing us before they condemn us. Our separation, we trust, will be only temporary. So soon as the causes of separation are removed, it will give us great pleasure to unite with our brethren. When the errors and calumnies, the partiality and the tyranny, by which the peace and prosperity of the Church have been destroyed, are corrected, and when, instead of a spirit of factious division, a spirit of conciliation and peace is manifested, we shall rejoice exceedingly in the restoration of union and harmony. For such a consummation we devoutly wish, and fervently pray. May the Lord hasten it in His time!

"Signed by the following Ministers, Elders, and Commissioners:—MINISTERS.—John Paul, D.D., William Henry, D.D., Clarke Houston, John Alexander, John Nevin. ELDERS AND COMMISSIONERS.—James Kinnear, James Adrain, William Moore, John M'Cracken, Andrew Blakely, John M'Vicker, Malcolm M'Cracken, John Roddy, Joseph Allen, Hugh Kernahan, Patrick M'Vicker, John Wilson."

After the Eastern Presbytery had withdrawn, according to a report in a public journal (the *Whig*, of July 28th, 1840), addressing the residuary Synod, Mr. Russel (Ballyclare), said—

"They were met on a most solemn and momentous occasion. The Secession of such men as Drs. Paul and Henry, whose names were in all the churches, would be known and animadverted upon in the world. He thought that at such a time, and in such a crisis, coldness and indifference ill became any member of that body. He had already made several suggestions to the Court, in order, if possible, to hit upon some method by which something like harmony might be restored among the churches; and though he was aware that it looked not well for a young member to be forward in these matters, he would beg leave to lay before the Session a motion which, he had reason to believe, would, in its adoption, be attended with beneficial results. It seemed that the impression made on the minds of the brethren, who had been forced to disunite themselves from that body, was, that they had no hope of redress at any time. The hearing of their case had been postponed, from time to time, indefinitely, till after the church should have adjudicated on the Scottish Testimony, which might be one, two, or more years. He would, therefore, as a first step towards removing this impression, beg leave to move, that the Synod pledge themselves to take into consideration, at the next annual meeting of Synod, these papers of Dr. Paul, containing a statement of various errors, misrepresentations, and calumnies, as charged by him upon members present; and, as the Dr. had quoted page and line, that the court should compare the extracts with the book from which the extract had been made; being satisfied that the extract had been fairly made, should proceed to adjudicate on the fairness of the inferences made by Dr. Paul; and, taking up the errors by him stated as before, would give approval or disapproval; and as there was sufficient time before next meeting of Synod, that the editors of *The Covenanter* should collect whatever objectionable matter they could from Dr. Paul's writings, in the same manner as he had done with theirs, and that the court should adjudicate on such in the same way as the others. If such even-handed justice were held forth—if such prospects of obtaining impartial adjudications were laid before the fathers and brethren, who had so unhappily seceded, he (Mr. Russel) considered that a re-union might still be effected; and that it was the only course, which as men and Christians, they could pursue."

After much confusion and discussion, Mr. Russel's motion was rejected, and a *disclaimer* modelled to suit the occasion adopted.

The following was transmitted through the clerk to the Eastern Presbytery:—

"Resolved—That this Synod disclaim and condemn any errors, calumnies, and misrepresentations, if any such there be, in the publication or publications of any who are or have been members of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Ireland; and they do not hold themselves responsible for the principles or statements contained in the publications referred to in papers held *in retentis*, or those that have been rejected for the time in the committee of bills of the present session.

"JOHN W. GRAHAM, clerk, *pro tem.*"

On this resolution the Eastern Presbytery made a few observations. They say:—

"In the first place, it is evident that you have neither disclaimed nor condemned the errors, calumnies, and misrepresentations of the Rev. Messrs. Houston and Dick; you seem to doubt their existence; you say—'If any such there be.' Now, if you doubt their existence, it is quite evident that you have neither disclaimed nor condemned them. A hypothetical disclaimer is *no* disclaimer; a hypothetical condemnation is no condemnation. The most erroneous and corrupt church in the world would subscribe the resolution. They would say—'If any of our members have published errors or calumnies, we disclaim and condemn them.'"

All the observations of the Eastern Presbytery on the resolution of Synod are far too lengthy to be inserted here. They have been published, and are worthy of a careful perusal.

There were other communications published, for which we have not space, a perusal of which cannot fail to convince the unprejudiced mind, that the Eastern Presbytery had not an open door for rejoining the Synod on honourable terms.

At Belfast, the ministers and ruling elders of the Eastern Presbytery being met, and the court constituted by prayer, adopted the Ecclesiastical Standards of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland: not merely the testimony, but the Terms of Communion, and the "Formula" of that church. They adopted the terms in their improved state, and the testimony with certain limitations, guarding especially against any statements

that might seem to favour Erastianism or persecution.

The Presbytery being met at Ballymoney, on 7th Sept., 1842, at the suggestion of the Moderator—Rev. John Alexander—it is moved and seconded—That a Moderator and clerk for the general meeting of the two branches of the Presbytery be chosen; and in pursuance of this motion, Dr. Henry is chosen Moderator, and the Rev. Clarke Houston, clerk.

The Rev. Samuel B. Stevenson, clerk of the Western branch, reads the minutes of the proceedings in that department of the Presbytery, and those of the Eastern branch are read by Dr. Paul. The minutes of the latter contain a record of the appointment of the Rev. Clarke Houston to attend as a commissioner from the Presbytery, at a meeting of the Synod in Moneymore, in March last (1842), and a copy of the communication sent by him from the Presbytery to that court. Mr. Houston was then called to give an account of the manner in which he had executed his commission. He stated that he had attended in the morning of the second day of the Synod's meeting, and found that the proceedings were conducted with closed doors; that he did not obtain access to the Court until 10 o'clock on the third day of meeting; he then stated, in respectful terms, the design of his appearing in that place, and intimated that the communication which he begged leave to lay on Synod's table, was of a pacific character, and that in his apprehension, the consideration of it would not occupy much of their time; that he respectfully requested permission to lay it on the table *then*, in order that, at their own convenience, they might consider its contents; or, if this was not permissible, he begged to be informed at what time he might have the privilege of presenting it. Mr. Houston further stated, that on the occasion, he was not recognized; that he was told he had no right to

utter one word in that place; that the communication could not be received from him then, nor at any other time, but that, as a matter of favour, if it were privately handed to a member of court, it might in that way come before the Committee of Bills; and that ultimately it was received in a private manner by the clerk, about three hours after the final adjournment, and that subsequently a short note in reply was submitted to him.

After this statement the Presbytery express their approbation of Mr. Houston's conduct, and inquired at the members, whether notice had been received by any of them that they were to be tried by the Synod at its meeting in March. To this inquiry the answer was given by all in the *negative*.

It was then moved and seconded, and carried, that the thanks of the Presbytery be given to Mr. Houston for the manner in which he had executed his commission, and their sympathy expressed on account of the treatment he had experienced.

The Synod had met at Moneymore, on the 1st Tuesday of March, 1842, in the absence of the Eastern Presbytery. At this meeting a committee, appointed "to investigate the whole subject of controversy, both with respect to doctrine and conduct," gave in their report, which received the approbation of the court, the Rev. Wm. Russel, and the elder from Ballyclare, dissenting. The Rev. Thomas Houston is declared—NOT GUILTY. The Synod endorse his teachings, and become identified with his public conduct.

In 1841, the Rev. Thomas Houston had published the Covenanter's NARRATIVE and PLEA, which, for abusive epithets and imputing motives, stands unparalleled. In this document, the Rev. T. Houston acknowledges that he did not acquiesce in the sentiment expressed in the quotation from the causes of Thanksgiving of 1823, and

that he was opposing Dr. Paul's *unbounded passive toleration.*

Dr. Paul, in a most masterly manner, answered all the publications on the side of intolerance. He published *remarks* on the Synod's "judgment," in two parts: the first part of his remarks was chiefly employed in showing:—

I. That the Synod were, by *their own acknowledgment*, both party and judges.

II. That while constituted in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, as a court of the Redeemer, their minds were not in a calm deliberate state, but by *their own acknowledgment*, in a state of "indignation and horror."

III. That the Eastern Presbytery, whilst under the Synod's jurisdiction, could obtain *no judgment* at all; but now, when they are not under their jurisdiction, the Synod have judged, condemned, and excommunicated them.

IV. That the Synod refused to receive *all the charges* against Messrs. Houston and Dick, and yet passed judgment as if they had received them all.

V. That the Synod refused to receive *all the evidence* produced by the Eastern Presbytery to prove their charges; and yet decided as if they had admitted and examined all the evidence.

VI. That the Synod would not allow the accuser and the accused to appear face to face.

VII. That the extracts in which Mr. Houston's errors are contained, the Synod *avowedly suppressed*, alleging that it would be unjust to lay them before the public.

VIII. That, on the contrary, they did *not suppress* those extracts in which the supposed errors of Dr. Paul are contained—thus convicting themselves of *the most palpable partiality* and *injustice.*

IX. That the Synod have acquitted Mr. H., but have refused to let the Church know the grounds of that acquittal—presuming that Covenanters will exercise implicit faith, and believe without evidence.

X. That the Synod have *identified* themselves with Mr. Houston's multitudinous errors—have adopted them—have stamped them all as *sound doctrine*—as the *doctrine of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.*

XI. That in the Synod's *apology* for Mr. Houston, they have sacrificed his *literary character* at the shrine of his *orthodoxy*, and represented him as a blundering writer, quite incapable of expressing what he means.

XII. That, on the principle of condemning Mr. Houston's *language*, and justifying his doctrine, they might acquit the greatest heretic that ever wrote.

XIII. That the Synod have professed to lay before the public the Eastern Presbytery's charges against Mr. Houston, but out of sixteen they have only quoted *four fairly*—the remaining twelve they have either *mangled* or *suppressed altogether*.

XIV. That of the *sixteen* errors charged against Mr. Houston, the Synod have only attempted to defend *three;* and that their defence of these is *a total failure*.

XV. That Mr. Houston has published to the world that no man can be a lawful magistrate except he be a *saint*—and not only a saint, but a saint who has arrived at *sinless perfection*.

XVI. That Mr. Houston rests the truth of our subordinate standards on the character of the men who composed them, &c., &c., instead of resting them on the firm basis of Divine revelation; and that the Synod, as well as Mr. Houston, has raised the subordinate standards above the Bible—*avowedly overlooking the Bible in their judgment, and substituting the standards*.

XVII. That Mr. Houston has done every thing in his power to subvert the whole fabric of the Protestant religion, by endeavouring to tear away the main pillars on which it rests—the right of private judgment and free inquiry; and that the Synod have sanctioned this unhallowed attempt.

XVIII. That Mr. Houston has taught that Popery and prelacy, in the Solemn League and Covenant, mean *persons*—and, of course, that Covenanters are sworn to extirpate Papists and Episcopalians; and that the Synod have pronounced this *sound doctrine*.

XIX. That, according to Mr. Houston's doctrine, Papists and others should be punished with death—(the reader will see this proved, Part I., p. 31, by twelve syllogisms)—a doctrine sanctioned by the Reformed Synod.

XX. That, acting on the four-fold capacity of *accusers, witnesses, advocates*, and *judges*, the Synod have condemned, unheard, not only Dr. Paul, but *the Eastern Presbytery*.

In the Second Part, after a recapitulation of Part I., the Dr. specifies three instances of absurd discipline, addresses a letter to Dr. Stavely, Chairman of the Committee, who had been at one time a United Irishman. In this letter Dr. Paul, among other things, refers to the first attempt of the Northern Presbytery to prevent the Rev. C. Houston—afterwards Dr. Houston, of Cullybackey—"from becoming the pastor of the Cullybackey Congregation, though elected by an overwhelming majority. The unconstitutional and tyrannical conduct of the Northern Presbytery in that affair was condemned—the Congregation was taken out of the hands of the Northern Presbytery, and put under a Committee, and

Mr. Houston was *installed*. The next attack upon Mr. Houston was an attempt to deprive him of his office as Clerk of Synod. To effect this, recourse was had to a *manœuvre, by appointing him Moderator*. The next step was to render his fee a mere trifle. The third was to deprive him of his office. In this they were defeated."

The Second Part of the "Remarks" fully exposes various "errors, untruths, and calumnies." It also refers to "the nicknames" invented by Mr. Houston, and gives the following as a specimen:—"New-light Innovators"—"New-light Friends"—"New-light Party"—"Schismatics"—"Factious Minority"—"Rev. Agitators"—"Eastern Faction"—"Eastern Sages"—"Eastern Separatists"—"Declining brethren"—"Declining gentlemen"—"Backsliders"—"Eastern calumniators," &c.

"Such," says Dr. Paul, "are the nicknames which Mr. Houston has invented for the members of the [Eastern] Synod! and for the special benefit of his friend, Dr. Paul, he has invented a number more: He calls him the master conjurer," &c., &c.*

CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE CONSTITUTION OF THE EASTERN REFORMED SYNOD TO ITS PRESENT STATE (IN 1869.)

In the year 1842, the Eastern Reformed Presbytery resolved—That, for the regularity and conveniency of transacting business, the two branches of the Presbytery be constituted into two distinct Presbyteries, desig-

* Dr. Paul may have been too rash in saying Mr. Houston *invented* these nicknames. He may have borrowed some of them, and slightly altered them for the occasion; for example, Mr. Thomas Paine—see *Simpson's Plea*—calls the prophet Jeremiah, "the old conjurer," and the Rev. Thomas Houston calls Dr. Paul "the master conjurer." New-Light is not a term newly invented. It was formerly employed as a designation of the deniers of our Lord's proper divinity.

nated the Belfast Presbytery and the Derry Presbytery. In pursuance of this resolution, the two did meet on the 18th of October, 1842, and constituted the EASTERN REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN SYNOD. This Synod has been recognised by the *General Synod* of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in America, and also by the [Large] *Reformed Presbyterian Synod in Scotland*, as the proper representative in this country of the Ancient Covenanting Church.

The Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Church, soon after the separation, received a little strength. The Rev. Mr. Gamble—a dignified Christian gentleman and eminent theologian—died in 1839. His congregation had been thoroughly taught by him to love the truth and hate persecution; and, as might have been expected, almost to a man, they approved of the stand made by the Easterm Presbytery. For the sake of convenience, Mr. Gamble's large Congregation was divided into two, and Mr. Samuel B. Stevenson (licentiate), having his choice, accepted of Milford and Ramelton, and Dr. Henry was called from Newtownards to Letterkenny, the other branch of the late Mr. Gamble's Congregation.

In 1843, it was reported by the Belfast Eastern Presbytery that a new Congregation had been organised in the town of Ballymoney; and that, by subscription, a Meetinghouse had been built at Eskeylane, in the vicinity of Antrim.

At a meeting of the Eastern Synod, held in Londonderry, August 6th, 1844, two letters were read acknowledging a copy of resolutions sent from the Eastern Synod to the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, approving of the stand the Free Church had made. The one was from Dr. Chalmers, dated Edinburgh, October 4, 1843, and signed THOMAS CHALMERS. The other, dated December 10, 1843, was sent by the

Committee appointed by the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland to answer addresses from other Churches, and signed PATRICK M'FARLAN, *convener*. Both letters were directed to the REV. S. B. STEVENSON, Moderator.

Some benevolent, enlightened, and zealous men in connexion with the Eastern R. P. Church, believing that the support given to the ministers of that body was quite inadequate, and that the old method of pew rents was not the most Scriptural, and observing how successfully the plan of a SUSTENTATION FUND was working in the Free Church of Scotland, took steps for having a similar Fund for the support of the ministry in the E. R. P. Church.

At a meeting of the General Committee of the Sustentation Fund, held in the Total Abstinence Hotel, Ballymoney, on the evening of the 3d November, 1846, the following, among other RESOLUTIONS, were adopted:

"That the several Congregations be requested to settle their account upon the old Stipend system to the 1st November, 1846, and that the Sustentation Fund shall come into operation from that date.

"That the Collectors be requested to call upon the Subscribers as frequently and as regularly as possible, and that the Congregational Treasurer be instructed to remit the amount collected to the General Treasurer, the first week of February, May, August, and November.

"That the VACANT Congregations, paying at the rate of FIFTY POUNDS *per annum* to the *Sustentation Fund*, are entitled to give a call to a minister; said minister, when placed, to receive an *equal* dividend with the other placed ministers."

At the meeting of Synod held in Londonderry, 1847, "a vote of thanks is unanimously and cordially passed, expressive of the highest approbation, of this Synod, of the active, persevering, zealous exertions of Mr. Hugh Small [Ballymoney], and other noble-minded men, who are labouring so faithfully and so successfully in raising funds for the support and extension of the Gospel; and whose exertions are employed in promoting the interests

of the MISSIONARY and SUSTENTATION Schemes of our Church."

The *Juvenile Missionary Association* was organized about the same time with the *General Committee of the Sustentation Fund*, and was chiefly intended to enlist the services of the *youth* of the Church in raising funds for the support of Probationers.

These Schemes succeeded well for some years; but at a Synodical meeting, held in Ballymoney, 1852, the Committee of the Sustentation Fund and the Commissioners from the several Congregations retired for consultation, and there is a recess during their absence. After the business of the Synod is resumed, they report that, having endeavoured to ascertain the amount that the Congregations severally will engage to pay to the Fund, they have been obliged, reluctantly, to come to the conclusion that the salary of the ministers must be reduced for this year, or that the Sustentation Scheme cannot be continued.

A lengthened discussion takes place relative to Congregations supplementing the salary of their ministers: the discussion ends in the adoption of the following resolution:—

"That, in the present state of the Finances of the Church, the Synod thinks it unnecessary and unwise to express any opinion regarding Supplementary Funds, leaving it to the congregations to act according to their own sense of duty to the Church in general, and to their respective ministers."

Mr. Small, after giving expression to his views, intimates that he cannot any longer continue Secretary, and retires. A deputation is appointed to wait on Mr. Small, and to urge the earnest request of Synod that he would continue to act as Secretary, at least for this year. To the deputation Mr. Small expresses respectfully his fixed determination to adhere to the resignation of his office, as he regarded the proceedings of the morning as indicating a departure from the spirit of the Sustentation Scheme.

Mr. James Galloway intimates his resignation of the office of *Treasurer*. It is *unanimously resolved*:—

"That the marked thanks of this Synod are due, and are hereby tendered to Mr. Small and Mr. Galloway for the great self-denial and liberality they have manifested in conducting the business of the Sustentation Fund. Their exertions are beyond all praise; and it is with deep regret that the Synod are forced to accept the resignation of these officers."

Supplements were given in some of the wealthier Congregations to their respective ministers. Afterwards, some of those Congregations paid their respective ministers, without the money passing through the hands of the Treasurer of the General Committee.

At length it was arranged that *a Home Mission Fund* should be raised to assist the weak congregations; and the sum of £30 annually has been given to some of them—the difference between £50, the minimum amount promised, and £80, which was the amount paid for years to each of the settled ministers—the ministers of the weak congregations losing whatever the respective congregations fail in paying of the sum originally promised at their ordination.

In the adorable providence of God, all the ministers who signed the *Protest and Declinature* have served their generation, and been removed, we have reason to trust, from the church on earth to the church in Heaven.

Dr. Paul went first: "it was his right." He departed this life on the 16th of March, 1848, in the 70th year of his age, and forty-fourth of his ministry. He was the esteemed and beloved pastor of the Loughmourne congregation for that length of time. He seems, however, to have preached as a probationer three or four years before his ordination. In the year 1800, he preached from Phil. III, 8—"Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord."—1st head at Cully-

backey: heads 2nd and 3rd at Kellswater. This seems to have been his first sermon, or about his first. His first appearance as a theological writer, as stated by his biographer, was in defence of *Creeds and Confessions*, the propriety of which had been impugned by a Unitarian minister of some note in connexion with the Synod of Ulster. In this publication the Dr. had occasion to touch on some other topics; and the vigour of his style, the acuteness of his logical discrimination, the sustained clearness of his argument, and especially the caustic, ironical, amusing pleasantry with which he surrounded it, when dealing with some hostile absurdity, attracted immediate attention. Dr. Paul's next—was also his great work—*The Refutation of Arianism*, published in 1826. From that period his fame as a theological writer of high eminence became firmly established. He published also the *Review of a Speech by the Rev. Dr. Montgomery, of Belfast*, in which he proves the doctrines of Unitarians to be "unfavourable to the right of private judgment, to liberality and charity, to the investigation of truth, and the practice of virtue." These three works were re-published in 1855, with a Memoir and Introduction, by the Rev. Dr. Bates, of Glasgow. There were some smaller productions from the pen of Dr. Paul besides his writings on the Magistrates' power, *circa sacra*. Only three of his sermons have appeared in print—one in a volume denominated *The Irish Preacher*, and entitled *The Pastor's Work and Reward*; one on *The Mountain of the Lord's House*, preached at a Sabbath School Union, Rathfriland; and a Synodical Sermon on PEACE.

In 1852, three other worthies of the Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Church were removed by death. The Rev. Wm. Henry, D.D., died on the 7th of August, and the Rev. John Alexander, D.D., on the 22nd of the same month. Both of these servants of God were emi-

nently endowed with ministerial gifts. Through a long and useful life they were sustained by the Master whom they loved, and whom they delighted to serve. For a considerable time before his decease, Dr. Henry had been in delicate health, and partially unable to discharge the active duties of the ministry. He was a learned divine, especially in the department of biblical criticism. He manifested much eloquence in his public ministrations. Two of his sermons have been given to the public in a permanent form—one *on the death of the Rev. Josias Alexander, of Belfast*, and the other a synodical sermon, entitled *The Warning to Sardis*, preached in Belfast on the 19th July, 1848, and published at the request of Synod.

The Rev. Dr. Alexander's death took place in the 80th year of his age, and 49th of his ministry. He was licensed to preach in 1803, and in the same year was ordained pastor of a Covenanting congregation in the neighbourhood of Derry. There he spent 22 years of his life, and was exceedingly popular and much beloved. In 1826, he was installed in the pastorate of the Belfast congregation, and about the year 1841, was appointed Professor of Theology for the students of the Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Church. In 1850, through age and increasing infirmities, he was compelled to resign active services. His theological ideas were rich, his language plain, and his delivery characterized by animation and fervour. He and Dr. Henry were lovely in their lives, and in their death not long divided.

The Rev. Clarke Houston, D.D., Cullybackey, died on the 13th November, same year (1852). He was a man of solid and lofty attainments, and of deep and manly piety. He was eminently distinguished for sound judgment, polished language, and impressive elocution. He was about 30 years in the Gospel ministry,

the last 34 of which he was pastor of the Cullybackey Congregation.

On the 22nd of March, 1853, death called away the Rev. Hugh Austin, pastor of the Eskylene Congregation. He had been ordained on the 24th April, 1849, so that his ministry did not last quite four years. Endowed with talents of no mean order, possessed of congeniality, and characterised by unyielding perseverance, he was giving fair promise of becoming a most useful and efficient minister, when death called him away from the present scene.

But while the Head of the Church was removing some by death, He was sending other labourers into the harvest. Mr. Close, the present pastor of the Loughmourne Congregation, was ordained to the office of the holy ministry, and appointed to the pastoral charge of that congregation on the 7th November, 1848. Mr. Marcus was ordained at Ballymoney, on the 15th of October, 1850. Mr. H. Stewart, a probationer from the other body of Covenanters in this country, was ordained at Newtonards, on the 20th November, 1855. Mr. John Robertson, who also left the same body, was ordained on the 4th October, 1859, and on the 11th November following Mr. Patton was ordained at Waterside, Londonderry. The Rev. Joseph A. Moody, from the Residuary Synod, was installed at Cullybackey, on November 1st, 1860.

The Rev. John Robinson died on 1st January, 1867. The Presbytery bear testimony to the varied gifts and graces by which the Head of the Church fitted their late brother for preaching, with fulness, power and unction, the glorious Gospel of the blessed God. They bear testimony also to the high moral excellency of his character. The Synod also adopt resolutions on the subject of his removal from them by death, expressive of the

loss they have sustained, and of their desire to lay to heart the lesson taught by this providential dispensation. Mr. Robertson was in labours most abundant. He was the author of several little works, mostly devotional, and of a Synodical sermon published by request. His mortal remains are interred in Gortlea burying-ground, in which also lie those of the venerable Rev. William Gamble, and of Dr. Henry, all having tombs or monuments, with suitable inscriptions.

The Rev. John Bole, formerly minister in the sister Church, North America, was installed into the pastoral charge of the Belfast Congregation, on the 16th of June, 1863; but he returned to the United States about 1st of May last (1869). The Rev. Samuel B. Stevenson succeeds Mr. Bole in Belfast. He was installed on the 21st September last.

The Covenanting Church in Ireland has been rather a witnessing than proselytizing Church. The Eastern R. P. Church has been a model for imitation, although she does not profess to be perfect. Other Presbyterians have of late followed her example in several respects. The General Assembly have, like the Eastern Synod, qualified their acknowledgment of the Westminster Confession, so as to guard against whatever might seem to favour Erastianism or persecution. The ordinance of baptism is also now administered in public among the large body of Presbyterians in this country; and the Act of Parliament by which the *Irish Church* has been disestablished in this country, and *Regium Donum* doomed, has led Presbyterians to look more earnestly at the method of ministerial support laid down in the New Testament: "Even so hath the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel." Since the union of the large body of Seceders with the Synod of Ulster, nothing but the "Psalms of David" have been

authorised by the General Assembly to be sung in the worship of God, although the use of the "Paraphrases" in some congregations has been tolerated. It is hoped that there will soon be improvement in the *Discipline* of that body.

The Eastern Reformed Presbyterians cannot be said to have a *Foreign Mission* of their own; yet, as a religious body, for several years past, they have done something annually towards the support of the R. P. Mission in *India*. They have done a little in their own country, by supporting a *Scripture reader* in Connaught for a time; and they are now beginning to give a mite to the Scottish R. P. Mission in the New Hebrides.

The Eastern Synod has always expressed its readiness for union with other evangelical bodies, could that be obtained without compromise of principle. To the Synod from which they were forced to separate, they have even made some advances.* The Eastern Synod

* That Synod has not been standing still. It followed the Eastern Presbytery in adopting the Scottish Testimony, instead of the old "Judicial Act, Declaration, and Testimony," emitted by the Reformed Presbytery, A.D., 1761. They have also altered the 4th Term of Communion, requiring the acknowledgment of "the renovation of the covenants at Aughensaugh, 1712, to be agreeable with the Word of God." For a length of time, the congregations of the Residuary Synod went forth "under different banners," pulling the pins out of the tabernacles, and "removing the ancient landmarks"—some ministers reading the 4th term in one way, and others in another. What prepared them for the change? A special meeting of Synod was held at Dervock, and on the 12th of October, 1853, the work of what they called *Covenant renovation* was engaged in. In swearing a new covenant, prepared for the occasion, they abjure, not only Popery and Prelacy, but also *Voluntaryism*. The bond was sworn with uplifted hands by the majority of the ministers, a considerable number of elders, and a few licentiates; and many of their people afterwards in the different congregations entered into the work. About a dozen of years afterwards (in 1865), after much disputation, Professor Dick moved, and Mr. Russel seconded, the adoption of the proposed change. Mr. Savage moved an amendment, that the change be not adopted; and this was seconded by Mr. Lilie. The motion was carried by a majority of 24 to 9. Mr. Sweaney desired his

entertains nothing but friendly feelings for their brethren of the other R. P. Synod in Ireland; and, as formerly, expressed in a minute of Synod (July, 1852), "They will hail with gratitude to God any opening in His providence for renewing intercourse with the brethren of the other Covenanted Synod in this country."

With the brethren of the *United Presbyterian Church*

dissent to be recorded. Their 4th term now stands thus:—*The acknowledgment of the perpetual obligation of our covenants, National and Solemn League, and in consistency with this, the obligation arising from the renovation of these covenants by the Reformed Presbyterian Church.* This is thought by some to have been intended to include their whole body as bound by the *Dervock Renovation*, although some, both of their rulers and people, refused to sign that bond. Whether it includes "the *Aughensaugh Renovation*" has been disputed. A few *Old Dissenters* entered into the Covenant at Aughensaugh in 1712, but the *Reformed Presbytery* was not constituted under that name till 1743. Still the brethren of the Residuary Synod hold communion with that fragment of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland, which separated from the main body a few years since,* but still retain the 4th term as held by the R. P. Church in Scotland, and by the Eastern R. P. Church in Ireland.

It is so far well that the acknowledgment of the Aughensaugh bond is no longer required; because the renovators, in their acknowledgment of sins, lament that the penal laws against Papists had not been put into execution, and engage that, to the best of their ability, they would endeavour to have them put into execution One of these laws was that persons hearing mass should be punished with death for the third fault. The other Synod has even gone before the Eastern Synod in making changes. They have recently prepared and adopted a new *Historical Testimony*, instead of that adopted by them about 1841. While, however, professing to bear witness for a Covenanted work of Reformation, it would be well for them to bear in mind the ninth commandment—*Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.* In the new testimony they say of the Eastern Synod (p. 109), "It soon became evident, however, that they had embraced sentiments inconsistent with the doctrines contained in the Westminster Confession." Query—What doctrines? Unless it can be shown that the Confession contains *persecuting* or *Erastian* sentiments, this statement must be set down for another *untruth*. It would be well for the young ministers of that body to search the records of the Church, and not take statements at second hand.

---

* They have held the closest communication with them, at least till lately.

in this country* the Eastern Synod is on most friendly terms. Deputations, for some years past, have been mutually sent and received by the U. P. Presbytery in Ireland, and the Eastern R. P. Synod. Both sections of the Church, represented by these courts, have been witnesses for many years against State endowments for the ministers of religion, and for the voluntary support of the ministry, at least in a divided community.

It is a remarkable circumstance that though several ministers, licentiates, and students have left the communion of the Eastern R. P. Church, not a single ordained minister of that body ever pocketed a penny of the *Regium Donum*, and only one of her ministers joined that section of the Presbyterian Church whose ministers received a Government pension.

The Eastern R. P. Church is at great disadvantage from the want of a religious Periodical to advocate her views and defend her when assailed † In many other respects she occupies high vantage ground. Her prayers for the overthrow of unscriptural principles, and the removal of ungodly practices, have already to some extent been realized; and she trusts they will have, at no distant date, an ample accomplishment. She has

* The U. P. Presbytery was formerly the *Associate Presbytery* in Ireland; but a few years since it became a Presbytery of the U. P. Synod in Scotland. It originated with the Rev. James Bryce, Killëug, near Coleraine. When all the other seceding ministers in Ireland accepted the *Regium Donum*, contrary to the decisions of their Synod, he lifted up his manly voice against it, and dared to be singular—to stand alone—till the ordination of Mr. Hugh M'Intyre (the late Dr. M'Intyre), which took place upon the 21st of August, 1816. The Presbytery has increased till it is nearly as large as the Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Synod.

† She can be misrepresented in public journals, as she lately was in the *Banner of Ulster*, in a review of a *Solemn Protest*, &c., recently re-published, while that journal refused to give space for a communication from one of her ministers who desired to set the public right on the subject. The above mentioned journal has since expired.

reason to hope that the Redeemer's prayer for the unity of the Church will ere long have a glorious realization—"that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, and that the world may believe that thou has sent me."

APPENDIX No. 1.

TERMS OF COMMUNION IN THE EASTERN REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

I. The acknowledgment of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God; and the alone infallible rule of faith and practice.

II. The acknowledgment of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and Catechisms Larger and Shorter, to be founded upon, and agreeable to, the Word of God.

III. The owning of the Divine right and original of Presbyterian Church-government.

IV. The acknowledgment of the perpetual obligation of our Covenants, National and Solemn League. And, in consistency with this, the duty of a minority adhering to these vows when the nation has cast them off; and, under the impression of solemn Covenant obligation, following our ancestors in endeavouring faithfully to maintain and diffuse the principles of the Reformation.

V. The owning of all the Scriptural Testimonies and earnest contendings of Christ's faithful witnesses, whether martyrs under the late persecution, or such as have succeeded them in maintaining the same cause; and especially of the Testimony emitted by the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland, as adopted by the Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Synod in this country.

VI. Practically adorning the doctrine of God our Saviour, by walking in all His commandments and ordinances blamelessly.

APPENDIX No. 2.

IN THE PETITION OF THE DISTRESSED CHRISTIANS IN THE NORTH OF IRELAND,

To the General Assembly, met at Edinburgh, May, 1644, are these words, anent Covenanting there, viz. :—

Your judgment is with the Lord, and your reward is with God, not only for your two years visiting and watering a barren vineyard, but also for your zeal and care to have your Reformation spread amongst other oppressed and borne-down Churches; whereof you have given an ample and famous Testimony, in sending hither that blessed League and Covenant, which we much desired and longed for, as by our Petition to the Church and State of our native Kingdom is known unto you. . . . And we, conceiving a chief part of our misery to consist in our want of opportunity to join ourselves with the people of God in the aforesaid League; esteeming ourselves rejected of God, and unfit to be joined in any comfortable fellowship in the Gospel with them, when the said League and Covenant was presented to the Regiments; we made bold to lay hold upon the opportunity, (though afflicted abjects) and cheerfully and unanimously joined ourselves thereunto: That if we perish in our misery, we may die a Covenanted people; and if our miserable life be prolonged, we may find shelter and refreshment under the shadow thereof in our fiery trials; confidently expecting from the Lord, by our nearer conjunction with you than before, an accomplishment of what is agreed to in the Covenant, which ye bountifully expressed before we were one with you, to your never-dying commendation.*

* *See Acts of Assembly*, 1644. *Ses.* 2.

APPENDIX No. 3.

ACT OF PARLIAMENT,

James VI., Parliament 1st, Cap. 5th.

Anent the Messe abolished, and punishing of all that hears or says the samen. At Edinburgh, December 15th, 1567.

Item—Our Souerane Lord, with Aduise of his dearest Regent, and thre Estaits of this present Parliament, ratifyis and appreuis the Act vnder written, maid in the Parliament halden at Edinburgh, the 23d Day of August, the zeir 1560 zeiris. And of new in this present Parliament, statuts and ordains the said Act to be as an perpetual Law to al our Sourain Lords lieges in al times to cum; of the quhilk the tenour followes. The quhilk day, forsameikle as Almichty God, be his maist trew and blessed Word, hes declared the reuerence and honour quhilk suld be giuen vnto him; and be his Sonne Jesus Christ, hes declared the trew vse of the Sacraments, willing the same to be vsed according to his will and word; be quhilk it is notour and perfitelie knawen, that the Sacramentes of Baptisme, and of the Bodie and Blood of Jesus Christ, hes bene in all times by-past corrupted be the Papistical Kirk, and be their vsurped Ministers. And presentlie, notwithstanding the reformatioun alreadie made, according to God's Word; zit there is sum of the said Papis Kirk, that stubbornely preseueris in their wicked Idolatry, sayand Messe, and Baptizand conforme to the Papis Kirk prophanand therethrow the Sacraments foresaides, in quiet and Secreete Places, therethrow nouther regardand God nor his Word. Therefoir, it is statute and ordaned, in this present Parliament, that na manner of persoun or personnis, in onie time cumming, administrat ony of

the Sacraments foirsaids, secreetly, or ony vther maner of way, but they that are admitted, and hauand Power to that effect. And that na maner of persoun nor persounis say Messe, nor zit hear Messe, be present theirat, vnder the pain of confiscatioun of all their guides, mouabill and vnmouabill, and punishing of their bodyes at the discretioun of the Magistrat, within quhais Iurisdictioun sik personnis happinnis to be apprehended, for the first fault. Banishment of the Realme, for the second fault. And Iustifying to the death, for the third fault. And ordainis all Schireffes, Stewards, Baillies, and their deputes, Prouestes, and Baillies of Burrowes, and vther Iudges quhatsumeuer within this Realme, to take diligent sute and jnquisitioun within their bounds, quhair ony sik vsurped Ministerie is vsed, Messe saying, or they that beis present at the doing thereof, ratifyand and approouand the samin, take and apprehend theme, to the effect that the paines aboue written may be execute vpon them. And therefore of new decernis, and ordaines the contraveneris of the samin, in ony tyme heirafter, to be punished according to the paines of the aforesaid Act aboue rehearsed.

APPENDIX No. 4.

PERSECUTION AND THE SLAVE TRADE.

Dr. Paul's Speech when a Testimonial was presented to him by his friends in Ballymoney, 9th December, 1844

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen—The subject of civil and religious liberty suggests two questions:—First—What is the reason that persecuting principles have maintained their ground so long in the Church? Second—What is the reason that the slave trade has maintained its ground so long in the State? These are two important questions. Even now, amidst all our boasted light, many good men think that *heretics* and *idolaters*, however peaceable and well conducted, ought to be punished by the civil Magistrate, and many good men think that it is right to hold slaves. And why do they think so? One reason is, they think the Word of God sanctions both. I say *one reason*. There may be many other reasons. Pride and ambition may be a reason—avarice may be a reason. Both these reasons influenced Pharaoh, and both these reasons may influence tyrants of the present day. But I am speaking not of *tyrants*, but of pious and *good men*. Why do *they* advocate the slave trade? Why do *they* advocate the punishment of peaceable heretics and idolaters? The great reason, I humbly conceive, is a *conviction, that the Bible authorizes them to advocate both*. The advocates for punishing *peaceable* heretics and idolaters, find, in the 13th chapter of Deuteronomy, that the Jews were commanded to put false prophets to death; and they consider false prophets and heretics to be the same. They find, also, in the 13th and 17th chapters of Deuteronomy, that the Jews were enjoined to put idolaters to death—to put their dearest friends to death

—to stone them with stones till they died. They find that they were commanded to destroy whole cities, to put to the sword men, women, children, and cattle. They find that this was the law, under the Jewish economy; and they ask, where was this law repealed? They allege, that, if the law is repealed, the repeal of it should be as public, and explicit as the law itself. That I may not misrepresent them, I shall quote their argument, in their own words. The author of the "*Reviewer Reviewed*," (pp. 75 and 76) writes thus:—"The doctrine of the repeal of the penal laws against heresy, idolatry, &c., or of God changing his plan, without his giving any notice, or supplying any record of the fact, would be an unaccountable and unprecedented anomaly in the government of God. It would reflect on the moral character of God, and the equity of his government, not to make the fact of the repeal of any of His laws as public and explicit as the law itself previously had been. Such conduct, on the part of human legislators, would be utterly inexcusable; it would be regarded as a violation of the most obvious principles of political justice. And shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his Maker," &c., &c. Such is the doctrine of Mr. Houston; and his Synod declare—"*We can perceive no ground of dissatisfaction with it.*" This reasoning, it must be admitted, is extremely plausible. No wonder it has deceived many; though I do think, that out of *twenty Divines*, some one might have detected the fallacy. Now, my friends, let me turn your attention for a moment to the *slave trade;* and let us see if the very same defence cannot be offered for *it.* In Leviticus, 25th chapter, 44th verse, we read thus:—"Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen round about you: of them shall

ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall you buy, and of their families which are with you, which they begat in your land; and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance, for your children after you to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever." Here is the law relative to slaves; and the *advocates of slavery* ask—and they have as good a right to ask the question as the advocates for punishing heretics and idolaters—they ask, Where was this law abolished? Let the advocates for punishing heretics and idolaters answer this question, and I will answer the question, "Where was the law for putting to death heretics and idolaters abolished?" If the repeal of the *one* law should be as public and explicit as the law itself, why not the repeal of the other? I ask again—I do it with great respect, but I do it with great earnestness—I ask, when was the law for holding *slaves* repealed? And, why should not the repeal be as public and explicit as the law itself? I call upon the advocates for punishing heretics and idolators, to answer these questions? I insist on an answer. It appears to me quite clear, that, if the law for punishing *heretics* and *idolaters* is still binding, as Mr. Houston and the Reformed Synod maintain, so is the law for holding *slaves*. Covenanters all agree, that the law for holding slaves is repealed. They all condem the *slave trade*. They do it not only in words, but in deeds. In America, where slavery still exists, Covenanters have excommunicated all *slaveholders*. In the Reformed Presbyterian Church, there is not a single holder of slaves. My heart is with Doctor M'Leod, who refused a call to a Congregation, because some of the members were slaveholders. My heart is with M'Kinney and Wiley, who travelled thousands of

miles to abolish the infamous traffic. It is honourable to the Reformed Presbyterian Church, that she is quite free from the stain of the slave trade. Oh! how I would rejoice to see her as free from the stain of persecuting principles. The Eastern Reformed Synod is quite free—but I will not rest satisfied till I see the *whole Reformed Church free.* I trust the time is not far distant, when not only the Reformed Presbyterian Church, but every other Church, will be quite ashamed of principles so repugnant to the mild and free spirit of Christianity. From the remarks I have made, I think it pretty plain, that the great reason why good and pious men cling to those principles, is a conviction, that if the laws for punishing idolaters, and holding slaves, were repealed, the repeal would be as public and explicit as the laws themselves. Now, in this they are quite mistaken. Here lies the fallacy. There is *no* necessity for such publicity and explicitness; on the contrary, I maintain, that such publicity and explicitness would have been contrary to the analogy of nature. The changes of Summer and Winter are gradual. The changes from infancy to manhood, and from manhood to old age, are gradual. In like manner, the change from the old to the new dispensation was gradual. When Jesus Christ introduced the Christian dispensation, He did not introduce it *all at once,* but gradually. I shall illustrate this in a few particulars. 1st. The breaking down of the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, was gradual. The Redeemer did not *publicly* and *explicitly* announce the breaking down of that wall. He did not say, "I now break down the middle wall of partition—I now declare that Jews and Gentiles are no longer twain, but one new man. I now declare them one Church." He said no such thing. On the contrary, He said, "I have yet many things to

say unto you, but you cannot bear them now; howbeit, when the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth." In a variety of parables he gave hints of the change. He spake the word in parables, as they were able to hear it. He was careful not to shock their prejudices, but gradually prepared their minds for the change, He sent an angel to Cornelius, directing him to Peter. By the vision of a great sheet, knit at four corners, He broke down Peter's prejudice, and thus gradually removed the middle wall of partition, and united Jews and Gentiles in one Church. In all this, the prophecy was fulfilled—"Behold my servant shall deal prudently;" and again, "He shall carry the lambs in his bosom, and gather them in his arms, and gently lead them that are with young." 2d. In the change of the Sabbath, the Redeemer acted upon the very same principle. Prior to the resurrection of Christ, the law of the Sabbath was, "Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work, but the *seventh* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Now, in changing the Sabbath from the *seventh* to the first day of the week, the Redeemer did not say, "I have now changed the Sabbath, you must no longer observe the seventh day of the week as a Sabbath. From henceforth, you must observe the *first* day of the week." The Saviour did not think, that the repeal of the law for observing the seventh day of the week should be "as *public and explicit as the law itself.*" He thought the very reverse—he thought it best to introduce the change gradually and cautiously. And why?—in compassion for the weakness and prejudices of the Jews. He had many things to say unto them, which they could not bear: the change of the Sabbath was one of these. 3d. The slave trade is an instance of the very same kind. The Redeemer did not say, I have repealed the law relative to slaves—He did

not say, I have abolished the slave trade. Such a public and explicit repeal would have neither argued wisdom nor prudence. On the contrary, it would have been highly injurious. It would have rivetted the prejudices of the Jews, and inflamed the enmity of the Gentiles. It would have exasperated the civil powers, and kindled the flames of bloody persecution. The Saviour adopted a wiser and more effectual plan for curing the disease. He laid down principles, by the operation of which the evil might be effectually eradicated. The golden rule of doing to others as we would wish that they should do unto us, is an axe laid to the root of this tree. 4. The law for punishing idolaters with death stands upon the very same footing. The Redeemer did not say, *I have repealed the law.* This might have shocked the prejudices of the Jews. But He laid down principles, by the operation of which that law—as well as the law for holding slaves—should be effectually repealed. The same principles which apply to the *one*, are equally applicable to the *other*. I go still further, and assert, that there is *much stronger* evidence, in the New Testament, for the repeal of that law which sanctions the punishment of *idolaters*, than there is for the repeal of that law which sanctions the purchase and holding of *slaves*. I earnestly request attention to this—I stand ready to meet any opponent on this ground. So much for the repeal of those laws which enjoined the punishment of *idolaters*. As to heretics, there never were any laws for punishing them, and, therefore, there could be no repeal of such laws. The Saducees were heretics: they believed that there was neither "*resurrection*, angels, nor spirits." Was there any law for punishing these heretics—*these gross and pestilent heretics?* Not at all. And if no law, under the legal dispensation, for punishing heretics, it would be an insult to common sense, to suppose that

there is any such law under the dispensation of the Gospel. If heresy or idolatry were coupled with *sedition* or rebellion, or some such *aggravation*, then, I admit it should be punished. This is the opinion of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Scotland. This is the opinion which they published, in their explanation and defence of their terms of communion, *half a century ago:* and this is the opinion of the Eastern Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, at the *present moment.* But we would not punish our neighbours as heretics and idolaters, who are otherwise *peaceable members of society.* We would not punish peaceable Roman Catholics, peaceable Arminians, Methodists, Quakers, Episcopalians, Unitarians, &c. We would not punish them for merely avowing and defending their opinions, or practising their own modes of worship. The Synod we left *would* punish them. We would *not.* This is the difference between us. Should any of our brethren say, as I understand some of them do say, "This is a calumny—we would no more punish our neighbours than *you* would;" my reply is, "Then, why do you not shake hands with us? Why are we two bodies? This is not *our* fault, but *yours.* You publish us to the world as *apostates* and as *enemies*: why do you do so? Have you any other reason but this—*that we would not punish our peaceable neighbours?* If you have any other reason, be candid, and tell us what that reason is. If you have no other reason, lay down your arms, and let the breach be healed." The principles of civil and religious liberty are dear to my heart—and why? They are Bible principles. In the dispersion of the builders of Babel, I see an astonishing miracle wrought in favour of civil and religious liberty. God himself comes down, and blasts the ambitious project of Nimrod. In the deliverance of Israel from the Egyptian bondage, I see the Almighty

working a series of miracles,—and for what purpose? For the chastisement of a tyrant, and for the emancipation of his own oppressed people. In the book of Judges, I see a history of the exploits of those patriots and heroes whom God raised up as the saviours of their country. Who could read that book, and not be fired with the love of liberty? Who could read the stories of Haman's gallows and Nebuchadnezzer's burning fiery furnace, and not boil with indignation against tyrants and despots? Who could read the books of Ezra, of Nehemiah, of Lamentations, of Daniel, of the Apocalypse—who could read these books, and not be a patriot? And who could sing the Psalms of David, and not be a friend of civil and religious liberty? Some wonder why we prefer the Psalms of David to hymns of human composition. We have many reasons. In addition to all the reasons we are accustomed to assign, I would just at present assign *one*. It is this—David's psalms are more favourable to liberty. In human hymns, we find no such denunciations of tyranny and persecution. In human hymns, we find no such compassion and sympathy for the oppressed. Let us give a few specimens. In the 7th psalm, God thus threatens the blood-thirsty persecutor:—

"He also hath for him prepared
The instruments of death;
Against the *persecutors* he
His shafts ordained hath."

In the 9th psalm we sing thus:—

"God, also, will a refuge be
For those that are oppressed;
A refuge will he be, in times
Of trouble, to distressed."

"For they that needy are, shall not
Forgotten be alway,
The expectation of the poor
Shall not be lost for aye."

The 10th psalm is a continued invective against the

tyrant. In verse 8th, &c., he is described thus:—

"He closely sits in villages,
He slays the innocent;
Against the poor that pass him by
His cruel eyes are bent.

"He, lion like, lurks in his den,
He waits the poor to take,
And when he draws him in his net,
His prey he doth him make.

"Himself he humbleth very low,
He croucheth down withal,
That so a multitude of poor
May by his strong ones fall."

The psalmist proceeds thus:—

"O Lord, do thou arise, O God,
Lift up thy hand on high,
Put not the meek afflicted ones
Out of thy memory.

"Thou hast it seen, for their mischief
And spite thou wilt repay;
The poor commits himself to thee,
Thou art the orphan's stay.

"O Lord, of those that humble are
Thou the desire didst hear,
Thou wilt prepare their heart, and thou
To hear wilt bend thine ear

"To judge the fatherless, and those
That are oppressed sore,
That man that is but sprung of earth
May them oppress no more."

In the 72d psalm we are taught to sing, in prophetic language, thus:—

"The people's poor ones he shall judge,
The needy's children save;
And those shall he in pieces break
Who them oppressed have.

"For he the needy shall preserve,
When he to him doth call;
The poor, also, and him that hath
No help of man at all.

"The poor man and the indigent
In mercy he shall spare,
And shall preserve alive the souls
Of those that needy are.

"Both from deceit and violence
Their soul he shall set free,
And in his sight right precious
And dear their blood shall be."

In psalm 94th, we read as follows :—

"Thy folk they break in pieces, Lord,
Thine heritage oppress;
The widow they and stranger slay,
And kill the fatherless.

"But judgment unto righteousness,
Will yet return again,
And all shall follow after it
That are right-hearted men.

"Shall of iniquity the throne
Have fellowship with thee,
Which mischief, cunningly contrived,
Doth by a law decree?

"Against the righteous souls they join,
They guiltless blood condemn;
But of my refuge God's the rock,
And my defence from them."

Psalm 102 contains the following verses :

"He, from his sanctuary's height,
Hath downward cast his eye,
And from his glorious throne in heaven,
The Lord the earth did spy.

"That of the mournful prisoner,
The groanings he might hear,
To set them free, that unto death,
By men appointed are."

These are a few specimens of the Psalms of David, which have inspired me with a hatred of tyranny and with a love of civil and religious liberty. A portion of David's Psalms I have heard sung in the family, twice every day, with very few exceptions, during a period of sixty-seven years. David's Psalms I have heard sung in the public Congregation from two to six times every Lord's day, with very few exceptions, during a period of nearly half a century. A portion of these Psalms I have endeavoured to explain, publicly, almost every Lord's day, during a period of more than forty years. Is not this a reason,—is not this a satisfactory reason,—for my attachment to the cause of civil and religious liberty? As an honest man, could I advocate the cause of tyranny and persecution? As an honest man, could

I oppose the cause of civil and religious liberty? In explaining my own feelings, I am explaining the feelings of the small body with which I have the honour to be connected. I have assigned a reason of the hope that is in *us*; and now, I would ask the opponents of civil and religious liberty to assign a reason for the hope that is in *them?* I would be glad to know how they can read and explain such Pslams, and sing such Psalms, and at the same time oppose the great principles of civil and religious liberty. How they can do this, is totally beyond my humble capacity to comprehend. They may, perhaps, say, "Oh! but the Psalms of David are not adapted to New Testament times." But how can they say this? Will they venture to say—The laws for punishing heretics and idolaters are adapted to New Testament times; the laws for holding slaves are adapted to New Testament times; but the Psalms of David, denouncing tyranny and oppression, are *not* adapted to New Testament times? Will they venture to say this? As the American would say,—"*I guess they will not.*" Were they even to discard the Psalms of David, this would not help them; their case would be still worse. Is the New Testament more favourable to tyranny than the Old? Quite the reverse. Is Jesus, the antitype, more favourable to tyranny than David, the type? Quite the reverse. The Redemeer was meek and lowly: his voice was not heard in the street: a bruised reed he would not break: the smoking flax he would not quench. How mild his treatment of the woman of Samaria, and the woman who was a sinner? He had pity on the ignorant, and on those that were out of the way, But, how did he treat proud tyrants, and *bloody persecutors?* How did he treat a domineering and an avaricious Priesthood? Did he *fawn* upon them? Did he *flatter* them? Oh! no. In language the most terrific, he poured upon

them whole torrents of invective. "Woe to you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, who devour widows' houses, and, for a pretence, make long prayers; the same shall receive greater damnation! Woe to you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, who strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel! Ye Serpents! Ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Of the persecutors of his time, he declared, that on them should come all the innocent blood shed, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zacharias. I am an enemy to tyranny, because Jesus Christ is an enemy to tyranny. I am an enemy to persecution, because Jesus Christ is an enemy to persecution. I am a friend of liberty, because Jesus Christ is a friend of liberty. "If the Son make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, and be no longer entangled with a yoke of bondage. I am a friend of liberty—forgive the anti-climax—*because I am a Presbyterian*—Presbyterianism is only another name for civil and religious liberty. I am a friend to civil and religious liberty—*because I am a Covenanter*—because my ancestors shed their blood in defence of civil and religious liberty. Strong is the truth, and it shall prevail. Strong is the cause of civil and religious liberty, and it shall prevail. It shall prevail, not because worms of the dust plead it, because *God pleads it*, and *the Son of God* pleads it. Priests may oppose it; politicians may oppose it; Churches may oppose it; States may oppose it; the tyrants of the earth may oppose it; "the great red Dragon, the old serpent, the Devil and Satin," may oppose it; but it will not do. "Woe to them that oppose it! They are fighting against God. The Kings of the earth may make war with the Lamb, but the Lamb shall overcome them; for he is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords,

and they that follow him are called, and chosen, and faithful."

NOTE.—To the intelligent reader of the preceding speech, a difficulty may occur—a difficulty which it is of great importance to remove. It is this:—If the golden rule of doing to others as we would wish them to do to us, is an axe laid to the root of the slave trade—if it virtually repeals the Old Testament law for holding slaves—and if it involves in it an eternal principle of equity—was not that principle obligatory under the Old, as well as under the New Testament dispensation? Surely it was. Well, then, if holding slaves *now* be a violation of that eternal principle of equity, was not holding slaves *then* a violation of the same eternal principle? And yet, there was among the Jews a divine law for buying and holding slaves. How can that law be reconciled with the eternal principle referred to? This is an important question. My answer to it is this:—Men may, by their crimes, forfeit their liberty. In that case, they may be enslaved. In that case, they may be condemned to slavery. The British Government recognizes this principle. The civil Magistrate sends criminals to Botany Bay, or some other penal colony—to be held in slavery for a longer or shorter period of time, according to the aggravation of their offences. The civil Magistrate does all this, without any infringement of the eternal principle of equity referred to above. Now, God was the civil Magistrate, when the law for buying and holding slaves was enacted. And those who might be lawfully purchased as slaves were only the heathen nations, who, by their rebellion against God, had forfeited their freedom. God employed the Jews, as the executioners of his vengeance on rebel nations. He gave them a commission to cut off the Canaanites, who had forfeited their lives by rebellion; and, on the very same principle, he gave them a commission to make slaves of those who had forfeited their liberty. On the same principle, idolatry was punished with death. God was the civil Magistrate—He was the King of the Jews—and idolatry was punished as high treason or rebellion. The case is quite different now. We have no such theocracy as the Jews had. We have no commission to cut off nations. We have no commission to buy and hold slaves. We have no commission to punish idolaters. The Jews, acting under a commission, were only doing their duty, when they put idolaters to death; but, were we now, *without a commission*, to put them to death, we would be guily of murder. The same reasoning applies to the slave trade. J. P.

APPENDIX No. 5.

THE COVENANTERS.

James, the son of Mary, Queen of Scots, had, as the ruler of that people, congratulated himself on being a member of "the purest kirk on the earth," thus exulting in his Presbyterianism; and had scornfully treated the Episcopacy of this country as having "all of the Mass but the liftings." But when, on the decease of Elizabeth, he ascended the throne of England, he avowed Episcopacy, and resolved that it should be rigorously enforced, not only here, but in Scotland also.

So early as 1572 the name and office of archbishop and bishop had been imposed on the Scots by a partial convention at Leith; and notwithstanding the General Assembly declared, in 1580, "that these officers had no warrant in the Word of God," the purpose had been formed to establish Episcopacy on the ruins of Presbyterianism. The bishops, therefore, enforced conformity with a high hand. Private Christians endured much suffering; and many faithful ministers were suspended, imprisoned, or banished, for refusing to succumb to prelatical authority. The consequence was that so intense did the hatred of Episcopacy become that it was formally abolished, and Presbyterianism re-erected in its stead. The Church and the Crown were thus brought into conflict; and while James was in Edinburgh, a tumult having arisen which exposed him to danger, the Parliament passed a law establishing the authority of the Crown over the clergy, and the king succeeded in obtaining their consent to his appointment of fifty-one of their number to titular prelacies, who were to sit in Parliament as representatives of the Church.

About three years after James succeeded to the crown of England, the legislature restored to the bishops a part of their revenues; and it was not long before they regained all their original powers. On the king visiting Scotland, he required that some of the rites of the Church of England should be adopted; such as the practice of confirmation by a prelate, kneeling at the Eucharist, and giving it to persons on their death-bed. These were

rejected by the first assembly that was convened; but the Scottish clergy were afterwards brought into a reluctant agreement with a Church which they considered as little better than that of Rome.

When Charles I. was crowned in Scotland, the people were shocked by the sight of an altar with wax candles and a crucifix, before which the officiating prelates bowed as they passed; and when the Archbishop of Glasgow refused to wear the gorgeous habits provided for him, Laud, who has been described as "the evil genius" of Charles, rudely forced him from the king's side, and put the Bishop of Ross in his place. The prelates now appropriated the civil dignities to themselves. They drew up canons which overthrew the whole fabric of Presbytery. They compiled a liturgy which came nearer to the Mass than that of the Church of England. It was reprobated alike in private, in public, and from the press; but a royal proclamation required it to be used in every parish-church in the kingdom by a certain day.

On the Dean of Edinburgh using it in St. Giles's Church, an old woman sprang up and flung the stool she sat on at his head, crying "Villain! dost thou say the Mass at my lug?" A violent tumult arose; and when the Bishop of Edinburgh attempted to appease the people, he would have perished on the spot, but for the interference of the magistrates. In the Greyfriars' Church there was no violence, but the service was interrupted by sobbings, groans, and lamentations. At St. Andrew's, and in three other Cathedrals only, could the liturgy be used; the efforts of the prelates were unavailing throughout the rest of Scotland.

To the repeated petitions of vast assemblies of the people for the withdrawal of the liturgy the king turned a deaf ear; he even issued a proclamation censuring the suppliants, and forbidding them to meet under the penalties of treason. But this was a fatal determination. The people resolved to renew the National Covenant, first adopted by the Lords of the Covenant, and twice sworn to in the reign of James. It renounced Popery, declared the liturgy and canons to be thus virtually abandoned, and concluded with an obligation to resist them, to defend each other, and to support the

king in sustaining religion, liberty and law. In the Greyfriars' Church it was solemnly ratified; thousands of all ranks subscribed it; and within two months all Scotland, except Aberdeen, was banded to the Covenant. The king resorted to arms, and the Covenanters to the means of resistance. Various hostile movements took place. In the reign of Charles II. the struggle was renewed: fierce was the conflict, and numerous were the victims at the hated shrine of Episcopacy.—*From the Protestant Dissenter's Illustrated Almanack.*

APPENDIX No. 6.

THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

The Westminister Assembly was chosen by Parliament to assist it by counsel and advice, but it was invested with no power or authority. It did not consist of divines exclusively, for in it were thirty lay assessors, and among these were ten peers of the realm. Scotland had its representatives of both classes as well as England. Of the hundred and twenty divines summoned sixty-nine attended, but others were added from time to time. Dr. William Twisse, of Newbury, was appointed prolocutor or president; and he commenced the proceedings of the Assembly by a discourse in Henry VII.'s Chapel, which was attended by both Houses of Parliament. This took place on the first of July, 1643, and 1,163 sessions were held before the close of its deliberations, on the 2nd of February, 1648-9.

"The Solemn League and Covenant," as it was called, which was referred by the Houses of Parliament to the Assembly, became the subject of discussion as soon as the Scotch Commissioners arrived. After some explanation on the subject of prelacy it was adopted, subscribed by the Assembly, and also by both houses of Parliament, each one standing forth with uncovered head, his right hand bared and lifted towards heaven, thus offering an act of homage to the Supreme, and

solemnly swearing to the performance of the Covenant. The Committee of States in Scotland ordered it to be sworn under the heaviest penalties, by the Lords of the Council and the whole kingdom. Shortly after it was directed to be sworn by all persons in England above the age of eighteen. The refusal of a minister to take the Covenant, or to tender it to his people, was reported to the House of Commons; young ministers were required to take it at their ordination, and for any not sustaining this office to decline it was to be excluded from all posts, whether civil or military.

A royal proclamation was issued against this course, but the reply of the States of Scotland was expressive, in the reasons it assigned for their conduct; and repulsive, in the advice it tendered to the King personally to sign the Covenant. Of the feeling of the two parties thus in collision there was one striking manifestation; the Assembly addressed the Protestant Churches of France, Switzerland, and the Netherlands, explaining their views and inviting their sympathy, and an appeal of a directly opposite character was sent them by the King.

Meanwhile the few Episcopalian divines who had at first attended the sittings of the Assembly withdrew: the reason assigned was that it was forbidden by the royal proclamation; that as they were not chosen by the clergy they could not represent them; that with them the laity were blended; and that the subversion of the hierarchy appeared to be the design of the Assembly. Those who remained were divisible into three parties; the Presbyterians, who formed the great majority, and therefore carried the course that has already been described; the Erastians, so called from Erastus, a German divine of the sixteenth century, who considered that the form of Church government, and the punishment of ecclesiastical offences, devolved exclusively on the civil magistrate; and the Independents, who maintained that every Church yielding itself to the authority of Christ, and taking his word as its only rule, was fully prepared, apart from all human authority, to answer all the ends contemplated by its institution. They formed at this time no inconsiderable body. To use the words

of Mosheim, the ecclesiastical historian, who belonged to another party, "The rapid progress of the Independents was no doubt owing to a variety of causes; among which justice obliges us to reckon the learning of their teachers, and the regularity and sanctity of their manners." Baxter, far from being their friend, sustains this candid admission—"I saw," he says, "that most of them were zealous, and very many learned, discreet, and godly men, and fit to be very serviceable in the Church. Also, I saw a commendable care of serious holiness and discipline in most of the Independent Churches."

Among the objects accomplished by the Assembly were a Directory for Public Worship, instead of the Book of Common Prayer; a Confession of Faith, a Form of Church Government and Discipline, and a Public Catechism.

"The best use," says Dr. Stowell, "that can now be made of the controversy as to toleration is to acknowledge the imperfect views of parties in that age, and to rejoice that there is no body of English Christians in the present day that would subscribe to the intolerant principles so zealously contended for by so many learned and good men in the seventeenth century."—*Ibid.*